

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

# BULLETIN

---

Vol. IX

March, 1923

No. 2

---

The Proceedings  
of the  
**Ninth Annual Meeting**  
of the  
Association of American Colleges  
Chicago  
January 11, 12, 13, 1923

Edited by  
Robert L. Kelly  
Executive Secretary of the Association

Published by  
THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES  
111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
February, April, May and November

Annual Subscription, \$3.00; Single Copies, 75 cents  
Entered as second class matter, May 13, 1922, at the post office  
at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for  
in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

---

### PRESIDENT:

Harry M. Gage, President of Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.

### VICE PRESIDENT:

Lucia R. Briggs, President of Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.

### SECRETARY-TREASURER:

Charles N. Cole, Dean of Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.

### EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Robert L. Kelly, 111 Fifth Ave., New York City.

### ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Samuel Plantz, President of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

Frank Aydelotte, President of Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

---

## FORMER PRESIDENTS

---

1914 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *constitution adopted.*

1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College.

1916 President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College.

1917 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College, *absent overseas.*

President Hill M. Bell, Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding.*

1918 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

1919 President William A. Shanklin, Wesleyan University.

1920 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College.

1921 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University.

1922 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College, *absent in Europe.*

President Samuel Plantz, Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding.*



## **STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS**

---

### **Representatives to American Council on Education**

One year—President John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College.

Two years—Chancellor John H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University.

Three years—Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo.

### **American University Union in Europe**

One year—President William A. Shanklin, Wesleyan University.

Two years—President J. H. T. Main, Grinnell College.

Three years—President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

### **Commission on Academic Freedom**

H. N. MacCracken, Vassar College, Chairman.

R. C. Flickinger, Northwestern University.

W. J. Hutchins, Berea College.

R. D. Bird, Occidental College.

K. D. Macmillan, Wells College.

### **Commission on College Architecture**

F. C. Ferry Hamilton College, Chairman.

D. J. Cowling, Carleton College.

W. W. Guth, Goucher College.

J. C. Burgess, Bradley Polytechnic Institute.

R. J. Aley, Butler College.

### **Commission on the Organization of the College Curriculum**

R. L. Kelly, Chairman.

Clyde Furst, The Carnegie Foundation.

W. E. Smyser, Ohio Wesleyan University.

R. F. Scholz, Reed College.

J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University.

**Commission on Distribution of Colleges**

S. P. Capen University of Buffalo, Chairman.  
J. L. McConaughy, Knox College.  
E. M. Hopkins, Dartmouth College.  
G. F. Zook, United States Bureau of Education.  
T. W. Nadal, Drury College.

**Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship**

F. W. Nicholson, Wesleyan University, Chairman.  
Samuel Plantz, Lawrence College.  
Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College.  
J. H. MacCracken, Lafayette College.  
W. A. Neilson, Smith College.

**Commission on Objectives and Ideals**

H. M. Gage, Coe College, Chairman.  
H. L. Smith Washington and Lee University.  
A. W. Harris, Board of Education of the Methodist  
Episcopal Church.  
W. G. Clippinger, Otterbein College.  
W. W. Boyd, Western College for Women.

**Commission on Psychological Tests and Methods of  
Rating**

W. D. Scott, Northwestern University, Chairman.  
Dean R. W. Husband, Dartmouth College.  
Professor Stephen S. Colvin, Brown University.  
President Arthur E. Morgan, Antioch College.

**Commission on Publications**

H. M. Gage, *Ex Officio*.  
R. L. Kelly, *Ex Officio*.  
C. N. Cole, *Ex Officio*.

**Commission on Sabbatic Leave**

Otis E. Randall, Brown University, Chairman.  
W. D. Scott, Northwestern University.  
J. S. Nollen, Grinnell College.  
M. S. Brown, New York University.  
Marion Talbot, University of Chicago.

# THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>College Objectives and Ideals</b>	
President Samuel Plantz . . . . .	35
President Rush Rhees . . . . .	50
Dean Marion Talbot— <i>The University of Chicago</i>	57
Dr. C. R. Mann, <i>The American Council on Education</i> . . . . .	61
Dr. H. C. Morrison— <i>The University of Chicago</i>	66
<b>Report of the Commission on the Organization of the College Curriculum</b>	
Dr. Robert L. Kelly . . . . .	70
President Alexander Meiklejohn . . . . .	79
Miss Margaret C. Alexander, <i>The Institute of International Education</i> . . . . .	90
President Richard F. Scholz . . . . .	97
President George B. Cutten . . . . .	107
Dr. Robert L. Kelly . . . . .	110
<b>Report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure</b>	
Dean Charles H. Cole . . . . .	117
<b>Report of the Commission on the Distribution of Colleges</b>	
President Melvin A. Brannon . . . . .	130
Chancellor S. P. Capen . . . . .	137
Dr. George F. Zook, <i>The United States Bureau of Education</i> . . . . .	140
President R. M. Hughes . . . . .	146

### **Report of the Commission on Architecture**

President John H. T. Main . . . . .	149
Mr. George C. Nimmons, F.A.I.A. . . . .	155
Mr. C. C. Zantzinger, F.A.I.A. . . . .	164

### **Report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship: Honors Courses in American Col- leges**

President Frederick C. Ferry . . . . .	172
Dr. Isaac L. Kandel, <i>The Carnegie Foundation</i> .	173
President Frank Aydelotte . . . . .	180

### **Report of the Commission on Sabbatic Leave**

Dean O. E. Randall . . . . .	188
------------------------------	-----

### **Athletics in the Colleges**

Dean Douglas Anderson, <i>Tulane University</i> . .	202
Dean Frank W. Nicolson . . . . .	207

### **Increase in Budgets and Endowments since 1920**

President Clark W. Chamberlain . . . . .	220
--	-----

### **Religious Education in the Colleges**

President Ernest D. Burton, <i>The University of Chicago</i> . . . . .	223
--	-----

### **The Work of the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students**

Mr. Elmer T. Yelton, <i>Executive Secretary of the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students</i> . . . . .	229
---	-----

## COLLEGE OBJECTIVES AND IDEALS

PRESIDENT SAMUEL PLANTZ

We have gathered at this annual convocation, a company of men and women held in the bonds of the friendship of knowledge, to exchange opinions, develop enthusiasm, compare results and enjoy what Augustine has so beautifully and felicitously expressed as:

"Converse amid cheer and kindness—difference without dislike— \* \* \* one learning from the other and again teaching him, wishing for the absent \* \* \* and thus by a thousand pulses and signals of the heart, revealed in look and speech, setting every mind ablaze and blending many in one." We all live, not in the seclusion of the cave, but in the fellowship of the spirit. It is, therefore, good for us to be here; and if any one has had pleasant dreams about this meeting, may they all come true. It is unfortunate for you, and equally so for me, that your president, so virile, humorous and companionable, gifted in thought and gifted in speech, shortly after his election embraced the opportunity for a deserved rest given him by his trustees; and has since then been touring in Europe studying political and social conditions as they exist there. If his mantle had fallen on my shoulders, as his duties have, I might give you something worthy of this occasion; but no such good fortune has come to me, so I shall have to ask you to try and be content while I take a little of your time in fulfilling what our genial General Secretary, Dr. Kelly, tells me is a strict presidential obligation, namely, to open the discussion of the evening on the general topic of *College Objectives and Ideals*. Fortunately this subject is a broad one, and a speaker can skip all over the campus in treating it without being out of form. Since this theme is considered at every annual meeting, there is naturally much danger of repeating what has previously been said; but I have found comfort about this in reading some lines Joaquin Miller wrote in reply to a critic who accused him of cheapening his wares by "repeating, repeating, repeating." He responded:

"There never were measures as true as the sun  
And the sea has a song that is passingly sweet,  
And yet they repeat and repeat and repeat,  
And the same old tunes through the new years run."

If the sun and the sea constantly repeat their processes, why may not we our thoughts?

A president's address before such an association as this is usually a survey of some of the "high spots" of the year in the work of the organization which he represents; and far be it from me, a substitute official in this brotherhood of learning, to start a radical innovation. However, I am moved at this time, not so much to dwell upon the year's achievements, as to talk over with you some of the criticisms which have recently been visited upon us, trusting that we may perhaps learn something by following Burns's advice in trying to see ourselves as others see us. This is not because criticism of the college is anything new to this generation. Indeed, it has become quite the thing for critics to tell educators, using the language of the campus, that they are off their trolley, or to put it in still more modern phrase, that they have a punctured tire. As in the old cathedral of Lincoln, England, there is a strange stone figure of a horned and hoofed little devil sitting among the beautiful sculptures of angels with extended wings, playing on musical instruments, so in the midst of our eloquent eulogies of education and the work of the college, the little imp of criticism often strays in to scoff and to deride. Some of this criticism has been very gloomy and gone so far as to bring to its front door the coffin in which the college is to be interred; nevertheless, the colleges have not been greatly alarmed, but have kept on with their work, trimming perhaps their trees here and there and changing somewhat the drives in their parks, but still pursuing their task of preparing the youth of the new generation to carry on effectively the activities demanded by our civilization.

The last few years, especially, when an unusual amount of lightning has been playing around the col-



leges' horizon, have been years of unparalleled growth and prosperity, with the result that the college is today more firmly rooted in the confidence and esteem of the American people than ever before in our history. However, the college is not perfect; no human institutions ever are. Our graduates, as has been complained, are not "a standard, finished product." There is, as we have been told, "too much waste being thrown on the dump-heap." Undoubtedly there is much room for improvement; and therefore, a little attention to what some of our critics have said about us during the past year may prove a tonic which will do us good.

Let me first introduce to you Mr. Bernard Shaw, who has recently expressed his views on education, as he has expressed his views on practically everything else, and who has spoken about as one would expect a man of his arrogant independence and mastery of mockery to speak. He has come out for complete individualism in education. He thinks the key word of the college should be *liberty*. He affirms that we are ruining the brains of our students by our requirements, by compelling them to do disagreeable tasks. He says subjects should not be forced down any one's throat, and that the only things worth learning are those which the student himself cares about. In short, his idea is to turn the colt loose in the pasture and let him caper.

The question of liberty and direction has long been a disputed one in education as it has in other interests in life. The pendulum has swung to both extremes and is at present dangling somewhere near the middle. We long had the fixed courses and the disciplinary theory. Later we had free electives and education by individual self-expression. At present the tendency is to walk in the middle of the road. It is interesting to note how often in life Aristotle's doctrine of the mean becomes the court of last resort. That there is value in the principle of liberty, that it has provided for individual interests and aptitudes, that it has greatly enriched the curriculum and that it has led many students to

seriously consider what studies will prepare them for the work they intend to do in life, is beyond question; but it is also a fact that it has led many in their culture to spread themselves thin over the curriculum. A smattering acquaintance with many subjects is by no means conducive to learning or mental power. It scarcely illumines one's general ignorance. It gets no grip on the soul. The choice morsels do not make a satisfactory intellectual meal. The student does not get a related body of facts which will be a stimulus to the development of new ideas, or of strong convictions on matters of consequence. While there has been some training in the labor of acquisition and some widening of vision in the contact with new truths, there has not been any welding of ideas into a unity of knowledge, or a deep enough look to lay the foundation for larger attainments.

Probably there is no more important problem confronting the American college than that of giving proper guidance to students in the selection of their courses, and stopping the hit and miss method by which many are losing much of the benefit the college might give. Of course, the colleges have done something to remedy the waste. They have instituted prerequisites and group requirements, majors and minors, and they have introduced the advisor system; but none of these things has eliminated the evils referred to. In all our colleges students are still choosing their work on the basis of fancied likes and dislikes, on student reports about professors, on the advice of upper-class men, or by reason of some incidental factor or trivial circumstances and with little appreciation of their aptitudes, needs, or the relation of studies to their future calling. There are two remedies which we believe would help relieve the present practice of miscellaneous browsing, or trying to suck the nectar from too many flowers. The first is the working out of a better scheme of the correlation of subjects. There are relations between subjects such that they vitally support each other and strengthen a man's grasp of them when he pursues them in proper order, and there are correlations of subjects to a man's future studies in graduate and professional

schools. If the college boy's education is to have unity, bearing on his future studies and work, if it is not to be discursive and aimless, a thing of pieces and patches, if it is to have any structure in it and not be an incongruous mass of general information in which the variety has helped drive out the facts, if the irrelevancies are to be eliminated and the educational training is to be conducted in a way to stand a chance of developing intellectual enthusiasm, there must be such a study of the proper correlation of subjects as will enable them to buttress each other to build up a structure of knowledge in the mind.

The second remedy which I would suggest is personnel work by a psychologist of large human interests whose time is devoted to the work. We need a man in our colleges, as President Scott has put it, "who will perform in education a function similar to that of the diagnostician in medicine." This person should secure all possible information about the student from his high school, parents and other sources; he should give mental and character tests; he should converse with the student to ascertain his interests and life purposes, and he should advise him in relation to his studies on the basis of the knowledge thus attained. The college in the past has proceeded too much on the theory that the man is made for the college rather than the college for the man. It should be more interested in right placement than in elimination, and this cannot be done by the present student advisor system in which uninterested professors with little or no knowledge of the student hastily and often thoughtlessly assign him his tasks. If there is anything valuable enough for expert advice, it is a boy's education, and the time has come when we need a personnel administration by experts whose primary interest is in the welfare and success in studentship of the boy.

The second criticism I wish to consider is that made by Ludwig Lewisohn in his recent book, *Up Stream*, a kind of second edition of *The Education of Henry Adams*. *Up Stream* is an autobiography, a confession and a radical criticism, in which the author takes "the mask off his

soul and speaks his mind on American civilization in the open." Like Henry Adams he spent several years as a college professor, having left his chair in one of our large state universities in 1917 to become dramatic critic for *The Nation*. His criticisms of American college education are trenchant and extreme and I do not care to go into all of them, but I do wish to refer to two of his most important accusations, namely the materialistic motive lying back of our education, and the almost entire lack of scholarly interest in our student bodies.

In relation to the first point he says: "To the average intelligent American education for which he is willing to pay taxes means skill, information—at most, accomplishment, skill and knowledge with which to conquer the world of matter. It does not mean to him an inner change, the putting on of a new man, a new criterion of truth, new tastes and other values." Again he says the idea is, "The college is to fit you to do things—build bridges, cure disease, teach French. It is not supposed to help you to live." We are developing, he claims, "A democracy of clever workers, incapable of close thinking, ignorant of the experience of the race," capable of being "dragged from one delusion to another, given the shadow for the substance, brow-beaten and enslaved."

There is no question but that there has come a considerable change in the spirit of the American college in recent years, and a noticeable secularization of its ideals and purposes. With the increase of wealth great numbers of students have been flooding in, some of them with heads so wooden that if one scratched them he would get splinters in his fingers. This has changed the curriculum so that it includes a great body of subjects which are intended to fit the youth for distinct professions and callings. It has also brought many specialists into college faculties who have no general intellectual interests and very little general culture. This has dimmed, doubtless, the bright shining of the lamp of learning. But is this so much of a loss as Mr. Lewisohn seems to imagine? There are great masses of American

youth coming to college who lack the capacity of serious intellectual interests, and who, under any system of education, would have little stirring in the depths of the soul, little aspiration and mind-hunger. The best we can expect of them is to do well the routine work of life, and by so doing promote the economic and social welfare of the communities in which they live. And this is by no means an unworthy achievement for a college—assisting youth to practical efficiency in the business of living and doing. Not all minds are contemplative in type; some are naturalistic and practical. There is a reason why realism and idealism have always trodden the pathways of the world together. If we have a Walt Whitman who can say, "I loaf and invite my soul," we have also a Carlyle to tell us "the end of man is an action and not a thought." Aristotle places the contemplative life above the practical, and Emerson and many others do the same; but however this may be, the great mass of men are called not to the study, but to the bank, the factory, the office and the marts of trade where the world's business is done. The college has a mission to this greater constituency—to fit it for what it is called in life to do. Indeed, one of the greatest services the college has given the world is in the line of practical affairs. It has discovered laws and forces in its laboratories which have made our modern economic life possible and brought in the comforts and advantages we so appreciate in our modern civilization. Learning that cannot be used is valueless; it must either have value in enabling the person to orient himself to the universe, assisting him to solve the theoretical problems of life, or it must give him greater efficiency in the practical calling in which he will serve his generation. The training which does the latter is by no means to be despised.

The second criticism of Mr. Lewisohn concerning the intellectual dullness and lack of scholarly interest on the part of college students is his most serious accusation. He says: "I look about me and watch for one face which betrays a troubled soul and a yearning of the mind, a touch of any flame." He thinks he has seen four such in eight



years' teaching, "outside of a handful of Russian Jews." Again he says: "All, all incurably trivial. I listen to their talk. It is of games, parties, examinations. Never the contents of the texts \* \* \* Who has ever heard an eager argument among these students on any subjects—art, religion, economics, sex—that are supposed to employ the minds of men? Who has ever seen them keen about anything except (symbolically speaking) football and fudge? It is as a matter of fact considered rather bad form among them to show any stirring of the mind." Again he says: "Their inner lives were supremely poverty stricken. Nothing in them cried out." Eighty-five years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson in his Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard University prophesied that the day would come "when the sluggish intellect of this continent will look from under its iron lids and fill the postponed expectation of the world with something better than exertions of mechanical skill." Mr. Lewisohn thinks that prophecy has not yet come true.

This criticism is a most vital one and may well challenge the thought of every educator. Is the product of the college all cinders and smoke and no flame? Are we producing dullards instead of thinking men? Is the light which gleams in the college halls pretty much twilight? Are we simply drilling the minds of the young, or are we setting them on fire? While it is doubtless one function of the college, as I have stated, to prepare inefficient youth for the practical obligations of life, this is not its highest mission nor its best. It is not simply a professional or a technical school. It has the noble task of preparing its students to participate in the spiritual life of their generation, that heritage of culture which the past has developed. This means that our students are to attain to such knowledge and secure such development of the creative faculty that they shall know the true, appreciate the beautiful, and serve the good. The college is to put the student in an atmosphere of ideas and ideals which will stimulate thought and awaken moral feeling. It is to liberate his soul from ignorance and prejudice and set him free to walk on the high-



ways of lofty inspirations and expanding life. It is to seek to make the cultural achievements of the past reborn in the student's soul, to arouse him to take out citizen's papers in the Kingdom of Light. It is to give sky, horizon, the large vision and the far reach. It is to enable students to hear the skylark's song as well as the factory whistle at the dawn. It is to endeavor to do for each boy and girl what Socrates did for Plato and what Plato did for the world famous Stagirite. It is to make those whom it trains appreciate the *Messiah* or the *Elijah* more than *It's a Long Way to Tipperary*, and the art galleries more than the movies. This is the ideal of the college, an ideal like all others in life, never more than partly realized, and yet ever to be held uppermost in thought.

The question which forces itself upon us is: Is Mr. Lewisohn right in telling us that this ideal has gone glimmering in American higher education, and that no sacred fire gleams upon our mountain tops? That there is much in what he says I believe we must all admit. The modern college has lost much of the fact and the spirit of learning. Aspirations for scholarship live only in the exceptional few. Intellectual interests have become largely subordinate to athletic contests and social stunts. The purpose for matriculating in college is too often to enjoy social fellowship, participate in rollicking escapades, and get some usable knowledge for the occupations of subsequent years. While some, a very few, crave knowledge and love the things of the spirit, the vast majority have their trolleys on the side lines and know nothing about connecting up with the cables of highest power. This all educators admit, and loud is the call for some means to create interest in the higher ideals of life and awaken a genuine enthusiasm for learning.

Of course, it is hardly right to state a case without attempting to prescribe a remedy. The time at my disposal is not sufficient, however, for me to do more than suggest an outline. First, I believe much would be gained if the subjects taught in college were presented to the student more in the form of his experience with reality. Text-

books and lectures are too often largely filled with generalizations adapted to mature minds of large information and developed powers of reflection. They are organized forms of knowledge for the convenience of logical minds. But in the world of experience reality does not present itself in any such manner. It is not a thing of definite facts and laws and formulas but of fused phenomena quite different from what is given us in books. There needs to be a better mediation between the logical presentation of the facts as usually given in college and the experience of immature minds as they have seen them in the real world. The approach must be more from the concrete than from the abstract standpoint. Teaching would thus become more real, more vital, and the interest of students in their work would be correspondingly developed.

Second, the college needs to realize that culture is not so much in the possession of information as the acquisition of insight, appreciation, understanding. The Athenian youth had a fine enthusiasm for learning although he had at his command little of the riches outlined in our catalogues. His information was limited but he was taught to think; he got an insight into the world in which he lived, and made its beauty "the beauty of his own mind." His culture was in a right mental attitude, a method of intellectual perception, a mode of thought. It was the result of a method of looking at things rather than a theory of education. Socrates got men to try for the meaning and value of things, and for some generations the students of Greece caught his spirit and largely followed his method. This should be the effort of the college today if it would instill into youthful minds an enthusiasm for truth. Instead of being absorbed with subjects, with the idea that much knowledge is much culture, it should give its students correct methods of intellectual procedure, true modes of thought, a right philosophy of life, a habit of insight, appreciation and contemplation. It should give the student a disciplined mind rather than large chunks of knowledge; an ability to solve problems rather than a body of facts;

a knowledge of how to attain wisdom rather than large quantities of it. Of knowledge it is written, it will vanish away, enter the land of haze, but of right mental habits formed, it may be said, they will abide forever. A student who in college has been taught to analyze facts, to form judgments, to perceive relations, to estimate values, to open his mind to the significance of intellectual and emotional phenomena, can not but have developed an enthusiasm for learning.

Third, I cannot close this discussion without taking a crack at our mechanical college methods, one of the most responsible factors in destroying the spirit of scholarship. We have placed too much dependence on external pressure and too little on stimulation and inducement; too much on regulation and too little on awakening interest and fascinating the mind with the importance and beauty of truth. Our method of instruction is mechanical, so many pages of the text, so many hours of collateral, so many hours of recitation per week. We have made the great end of college work, not gaining the ability to think, but the attaining of credits. The emphasis is not on correct methods of intellectual work, but on securing the 120 credits and 120 points necessary for graduation. And to see that these credits are properly obtained, we have our daily marks, our tests and quizzes, our outlines and our finals. There is probably no greater cause of the student's losing the point as to why he is in college than this everlasting hammering on the matter of credits. This is what the student has his eye on, not the content of learning, not the enriching quality of culture, not the joy of the spirit in freeing itself from bondage and learning how to commune with nature and value the accumulated wisdom of the world. I do not know what substitute we shall find for our present method, but I do know that the spirit of learning is hard to foster in a scheme of mechanical processes such as now characterizes the American college. It is to be hoped that some of our institutions which are now working on this problem will soon show a better way of measuring intellectual results.

The third criticism I desire to refer to, although I have not time to discuss it at any length, was made by Dean Walter S. Athearn of Boston University in an address delivered at the International Sunday School Convention held in Kansas City last June. He used the following words: "The next step is to redeem the church college. Mark you, I said *redeem* the church college. Church colleges are now, with exceptions, of course, indistinguishable in program and ideals from the public schools, and they are practically dominated by the interests that control the public school system. We must turn them back to the service of the church." Later he says, "If this cannot be done, and if the church colleges cannot train leaders in the social program of Jesus, if they cannot do more in giving the Christian interpretation to science and philosophy, and if they cannot do better in teaching Biblical history and literature, they should be put out of business."

It is a matter of agreement between all of us that the American college is a Christian foundation and that those who have supported it and made its development possible have believed, in the words of President Harding, that "Christian education is essential to Christian citizenship and right civic leadership." Even as liberal a journal as *The New Republic* not long ago stated that the present awful predicament of civilization is due to the divorce between religion and education and the steady expansion of secular knowledge which is devoid of moral sanction and authority, in the lives of Christian people; and it went on to affirm: "If the secularization of knowledge continues it will wreck civilization." We have constantly held, as the reason for being of the Christian college, as President Hadley has put it, that "To produce character, education must call to her assistance religion." In this day—especially—when the moral foundations of society seem shifting and in some places to be tottering, it is imperative that the Christian college prepare a leadership for the world which is established in Christian principles and guided by Christian motives. To secure such leadership the college must

supervise and direct the religious development of its students as truly and faithfully as it looks after their intellectual growth.

As a matter of fact, is this being done in our Christian colleges? There is no question that character building is still the purpose and desire of the great majority of our institutions, and that much is being accomplished for the development of the student's moral and spiritual life. The colleges still maintain their Christian ideals and encourage religious activities; but it must be confessed that many of them have, at the same time, permitted student life to drift toward the rocks of religious indifference and secularization. The over-growth of extra-curricular activities, the extravagance of social life, the grouping of students in fraternity houses where there are few Tom Browns to throw their boots at the fellows who taunt when the Arthur Stanleys kneel to say their prayers; the extreme emphasis placed on athletics and the gambling and drinking often attending intercollegiate games, the rage for the sensational movies and the vaudeville shows, the large allowances made by indulgent fathers to immature sons, the sensual tendencies of the new dances, the degenerating influence of jazz, the coming of the automobile on the campus, the growing tendency to neglect church attendance and to make the Sabbath a day for pleasure and study—all these movements have grown greatly in our Christian colleges in recent years, and have shown a result of indifference to religion and of fast living which would have alarmed the college of a generation ago.

Another noticeable factor is the change in the religious activities of many college professors. The average teacher in a Christian college forty years ago felt strongly that he had a duty to help build up Christian character in the lives of his pupils. He took his work as a religious opportunity. Very often he was a clergyman, in the teaching profession primarily to help develop the character of young men, and when not he was usually an earnest Christian man. He talked with students about their personal problems and



about engaging actively in the Christian life. But now our colleges have teachers most of whom are of a different type. They are practically all Christian men and members of the church; but they have been trained largely in secular universities as specialists in some department of learning and are absorbed in their intellectual interests. They are working on problems of research, publishing articles and books, and are too busy with their specialties to give much time either to their own spiritual development or to do personal Christian work with students. They may occasionally attend a Y. M. C. A. meeting to show a passing interest, but they feel their work is to teach subjects, and not to do religious work with young men. Of course, there are exceptions to what I have stated, earnest men and women in the faculties who are trying to build Christian character, and earnest students who are trying to help their fellows, but I have indicated the drift, as I see it. The Christian college has to a degree become secularized and lost the earnestness of the earlier religious spirit.

The question is, what is to be done to stem the tide in a matter so important as developing the religious leadership of the next generation and caring for the moral foundations of the nation? Certainly the first consideration is not to remain dogmatically true to the past and guide the feet of students carefully along the pathways of the old faith, even to the repudiation of well established scientific conclusions, as Mr. Bryan and other reactionaries advise. The college's difficulty at present is not with laxity of belief but laxity of life. It must repudiate the idea that formalism is religion and present it as a living force for the regeneration of human nature and the renovation of society. But besides this the college needs to do certain things to save itself which I can only mention.

It must try to get its teachers to interpret truth as far as possible from the spiritual standpoint. The Christian college should have professors who have grasped the Christian philosophy of nature and of life, and this should underlie their interpretations of the various fields of knowledge.



The college must try to arouse its faculty to the important task of promoting Christian interests in the institution and developing Christian character. This must be so insisted upon that the professor spiritually dead will find he is not in a congenial atmosphere.

The college needs to establish more courses in religious subjects, departments of English Bible, religious education, and courses in Christian ethics, the fundamentals of Christianity, etc., and have them taught by enthusiasts who can make the subjects vital and develop interest in them. Students always go to the class rooms of dynamic teachers who are interested in them personally, whatever they teach.

Care should be taken that the departments of psychology and philosophy are in the hands of strong Christian thinkers, and deeply spiritual men, for dealing with fundamental problems they can do much to establish religious convictions.

There must be constant thought given about how the Christian atmosphere can be preserved and the Christian ideals be made dominant in the college. The chapel service and the vesper service should be made vital factors in the life of the institution, and occasions for impressing the fundamental Christian principles on the minds of the people. There must be a careful organization of the Christian members of the student body to maintain religious services and associations, and keep Christian ideals dominant on the campus. They must be led to denounce immoralities and student vices in all their varied forms.

And finally I believe the college can well afford to have the right type of man on the faculty whose time shall be given wholly or largely to the direction of Christian interests, a man who can get close to students, and as a kind of personnel director can promote in wise ways the claims of religion upon the young life of the college. This is more important since the attendance upon our colleges is increasing so rapidly and since professors are so busy with their regular tasks. The small college has great advantages over large ones for Christian results, but since most of our colleges are becoming large colleges, we must

have better organized methods and more agencies to promote religious life and work.

But whatever the method, the one thing we must do is maintain the Christian ideal and purposes of our colleges. It is stated that there is a statue of Phillips Brooks erected near the church where he had his notable ministry. Of late there has been much discussion about it and whether it is artistically equal to another statue of the famous bishop on or near the grounds of the School of Technology. I know nothing about the art merits of the two statues, but there is a feature about the one near Trinity Church which appeals to me, and this is that a little to the side and slightly back of the famous preacher, who is standing in his pulpit, the artist has placed the figure of the Christ whom he so faithfully preached. Phillips Brooks is best represented with the Master standing near. So may it be with our Christian colleges. May they be so true to their spiritual mission that they will be best represented by Christ standing in the midst of them.

#### PRESIDENT RUSH RHEES

##### MR. TOASTMASTER, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I do not know anything more hopeful and helpful to men and women charged with responsibility in education than the consideration of criticism. One of the greatest difficulties that besets our life and work is isolation. We are likely to find ourselves pocketed in a back-water away from the currents of life of the busy world, and anything which challenges us away and makes us inquire whether after all our work is anything more than a traditional routine is wholesome and stimulating and, I think we will all acknowledge, refreshing, because at least it makes us sit up and be awake. It would be extremely interesting to follow the very suggestive outline of criticisms that have been made by our presiding officer, if that were suitable to my task upon this occasion.

Frankly, I haven't quite understood what I was supposed to do with this topic, "The Year's Progress in Ob-

jectives and Ideals in Education," and being a little at a loss for a definition, I have turned back upon the experience of the year and have determined to bring to you a consideration of two or three problems that seem to me to affect the objectives and ideals of the college as I know the college.

The first of those that I wanted to speak of is that which is presented by the problem of limitation of numbers. A very extraordinary thing has happened within the last ten years. While very few of us would have acknowledged it frankly and openly, there was a good deal of quiet congratulation if the enrollment of this year was in excess of the enrollment of last year; if, in looking back over a period of five or ten years, we and our constituents could say, "See the growth of this institution. Consider the numbers that were in attendance five years ago, ten years ago, and look at the enrollment today."

Now, in this present year we find all over the country an epidemic of conviction that the only thing that can save the college is to restrict its numbers. Young men and young women are seeking admission to our college classes in such enormous numbers that we are aroused to the consideration of the fact that we can't take care of them, and we have, some of us, announced more or less definitely and openly that we must adopt a policy of limiting the numbers of students we will receive. But the announcement of such a policy is only the beginning of trouble. How are we going to make the selection? The most obvious suggestion is to select those whose entrance credentials by examination or school record are highest; but then we are troubled, we are troubled by memory. We think of this one and that one and another one who entered college with very unpromising preparation and after a little time demonstrated the possession of power that gave ultimately very distinctly superior attainment and the accomplishment of a genuine leadership.

How, if we are going to restrict our numbers, are we to protect ourselves from the very fatal mistake of excluding

some of those who have within them the promise of the greatest accomplishment? I may say that the man who entered college in my class and over whom we were told the faculty debated long whether he should be admitted because of his inferiority of preparation, took the prize for excellence at the end of the Senior year. It may be if we restrict numbers simply by the consideration of accomplishment in the secondary school we will send off into other activities of life some of the men most needed as intellectual leaders by our generation.

Then there is another suggestion that is sometimes practical, that not only accomplishment of a scholarly sort in the secondary school will be considered, but as far as possible through personal interview or letters from those who know these candidates, we will endeavor to pick the men of the most promising personality. We will find out, if we can, whether there is something in these candidates to be considered besides their academic status, and make a balance of these things, and in selecting the students that may be admitted to our classes try to take some of those who may not be scholastically as high as others but who seem to have the promise in personality and other attributes for a superior accomplishment. And that is very good if we can guess right. But again we are confronted with the very serious question as to whether we can guess right. Now there is offered to us with a good deal of confidence by our psychological friends a device that will substitute knowledge for guess work, and we are urged to apply a system of carefully wrought out psychological tests that will enable us to discover what are the aptitudes of these candidates that are coming to us. Using these tests, either as the measure of a candidate's admissibility to college, or as one factor in the problem to be considered with those of scholarly attainment and personality, we may hope to make the selection which will give to the college the men best adapted to profit by its opportunity and consequently will give the community the trained citizens most needed by the community.

But when we come to the consideration of these psychological tests there are some of us either because of innate perversity or obtuseness of mind that are not entirely convinced. I have in mind a man who entered our Freshman class this year. We applied the Thorndyke tests to our Freshmen and we are very much interested in the results. This man was rated by those tests almost exactly at the middle of the class. At the end of the first half term when it is our practice to make a survey as to the accomplishment of the young students that have entered, it so happens this youngster was one of the first two in accomplishment. Now, what is the matter? There were fifty or sixty men superior to him, according to the psychological rating. I believe, if I recall rightly, there was one man superior to him in actual accomplishment so far in college work. When we took the trouble to investigate a bit further we found out one or two things. In the first place, the young man was abnormally industrious (laughter), and in the second place he was abnormally ambitious, but that quality of industry and that quality of ambition were not detected by the psychological test. If we are going to rely upon psychological tests as a major factor in the determination of admission of students to college we must ask our psychological friends to devise something that will measure attitude and ambition and habitual industry, in addition to those qualities of alertness of mind, and whatever else you may choose, that are to be rated in the estimate of the young man's ability and promise.

We haven't yet developed a very clear method of determining who are the men that ought to be admitted, but there are certain advantages that I see in the experience that is coming to us from this enforced restriction of numbers. In the first place, the reaction upon the secondary schools is a little short of miraculous. Principals of such schools are telling us that there is an entire change of attitude on the part of the young men who are preparing to go to college, due to the discovery that the simple accomplishment of the task set as prerequisite to college does not



guarantee them an opportunity to get in,—that they must at least attain something like superiority. That is so much to the good.

Secondly, I think that any policy of restriction of numbers is going to have a very decided effect upon our apprehension of our own objectives and ideals, even if we do find that we are turning over to somebody else the question, What is the community going to do with the multitude of youth whom the colleges cannot or will not admit to their classes? Just what are we going to do for the men, if we can find them, who possess ambition and industry added to the requisite native ability, as shown in scholastic accomplishments and in the evidence elucidated by whatever tests we may present? What are we going to do for the honor man in college? One of the criticisms that was presented to us with great clearness in the preceding address was that we are giving our attention altogether too much to mediocrity, that there isn't enough done for the development of the superior man, that somehow or other we fail to call out the ambitions of intellectual life. Is there anything we can do to better that situation? Now, being a college executive and as such consequently cowardly and desirous of passing responsibility on to other people's shoulders, I might remark that our students' disregard for intellectual superiority is a part of all contemporary life,—it isn't something that is to be found only in college circles. A generation or two ago the multitude was inclined to put a very high value on intellectual superiority. In our day the multitude puts a very high value on earning capacity. If we are criticized because the operations of our colleges are very largely materialistic in their end, the criticism is valid in so far as it indicates the college is responding a little too readily to the influences of its environment.

But I know there isn't a man or woman engaged in college activity who isn't thrilled by the discovery of the boy or girl of distinct intellectual eagerness, and we do find them once in awhile. What are we going to do with them? Must we put them through exactly the same mill that all



the mediocre and perplexing students we have to deal with have to go through? Is there nothing better we can do for them? We are all of us studying that question, and a good many of us feel we haven't yet got a solution of it. The policy of the universities to the north of us, across the Canadian line, is rather alluring. They have two distinct courses, a pass course and an honors course. The man who wants to reside in college for social or incidental purposes is allowed to take a course that will lead him to a pass degree, and the real student is given an opportunity for exacting discipline and training leading to an honors degree. Can we adopt something like that plan for our colleges in this country? Or may we perhaps say that we will allow a man of demonstrated superiority of ability, (as shown in accomplishment in the tasks that are set to him in the Freshman year, if you please), to meet the requirement of graduation by a reduced number of things he has to do in order to encourage an increased quality of accomplishment that he may attain? I confess that that appeals to my mind with an enormous attraction. If we can find a man of great ability and equivalent ambition and give him the opportunity to concentrate all or nearly all of his attention on one thing and do three times as much work on a course in philosophy or economics or history as the class is required to do, isn't it likely that that man will come out of our college with a better mind and a finer education than if we insist that he must have the rubber stamp of every professor supposed to have to do with him?

Now, there are certain factors of administrative difficulty in that proposal and I don't know that we can say we have got much further with reference thereto than to recognize it as something greatly to be desired, if we can formulate the method by which it can be effectively realized.

But immediately the college executive is confronted by another difficulty accentuated in connection with precisely this consideration and that is the difficulty of the mounting costs of education. I could spend a good deal more time than you are willing to give me in speaking on that subject.

It doesn't concern only the cost of college education, it concerns the cost of all education. Are we running completely wild, forgetting that there is a possible limit to the amount of money which a community by taxation or by gift may allocate for education? In our conception of the equality that is desirable or necessary, in our conception of the personnel that is desirable or necessary, in order to accomplish an education, we are afflicted by a feeling that somehow we must multiply opportunity in response to every request. I confess to you with great candor that sometimes I find myself greatly embarrassed when some earnest searcher for truth asks me, "Well, haven't you a professor of this or that in Rochester?" and I have to say, "No." Then when I go back to the quiet of my own study and inquire, "Well, now, can I justify that answer?" I am forced to this conclusion, "Is it not better, in the measure of good judgment that may be vouchsafed to us, to concentrate our energy and resources on doing some things as well as we can do them, instead of feeling that, at the sacrifice of excellence in those things we ought to undertake something else and spread our resources out a little thinner? Is there not room in our college administration for a counsel of self-denial with reference to a variety of enterprise if we can in some way insure to our students an opportunity for thoroughness and excellence in at least a sufficient number of subjects to offer them a real education?"

I said I was simply going to give you a glimpse into some of the troubles that administration of education has presented to my mind within the past year. I believe that it is probable that out of the contemplation of difficulty we oft-times find the way of progress. I am optimistic enough to hope that that may happen in some measure with reference to the problems that our colleges have before them, and that we may go from our intercourse here with courage at least to look for the way of realization of definite objectives and worthy ideals within the limits of available resources.

## DEAN MARION TALBOT

Dr. Kelly has asked me to speak on any phase of the subject, College Objectives and Ideals, which might appeal to me. It is natural that I should choose one relating specially to women.

When I was a little girl I went to a school whose teacher of history had the theory that the earliest known history should be taught first and then down the ages to the present time. I never got further than Nineveh and Babylon. I will try and do a little better than that tonight even though I begin by recalling a few chapters of ancient history drawn from the period of my girlhood. In those days the intellectual achievements of their boy friends who went to college did not seem to many girls beyond their own powers. In Boston, however, there was no provision in the public schools for a girl to be fitted for college. I had to be privately taught. My mother was chiefly responsible for the establishment of the Girls' Latin School in Boston and my younger sister was one of its first pupils. A friend of mine was the first girl to take the Harvard entrance examinations, a feat which caused great excitement. She is still living, and from my point of view not terribly old. But the wheels began to move fast and then came a series of dire predictions of the disasters which would follow giving girls an opportunity to train their minds.

The first objection—that they hadn't any minds to train—was a bogey which experience soon proved harmless. Then came Dr. Clarke's book, *Sex in Education*, claiming that the sex would be ruined physically if girls were put under such severe mental strain as the boys in college were subjected to. It was soon recognized that the exercise of the mind is an essential factor in health. Then came the cry that women would be made mannish or possibly worse still, unsexed. It has been rather amusing to recall these views in recent years when various attempts have been made to give men a fair chance by segregating them in the class room, closing Phi Beta Kappa to women, setting

limits to the number of women who may receive collegiate training—when the influence of women is given as one explanation of defeat in athletics. I need not go on. Such as they were, those problems do not concern us today, except to bring into relief present day problems and to encourage those of us who are tempted to be discouraged by the slow rate at which academic recognition is given to women. Let us pass over the years—few they seem to me—and see what the situation is today.

I shall speak briefly of two problems. The first is College Objectives and Ideals for women as affected by the clashing claims of marriage and of professional life or economic independence.

An investigation of American colleges made not long ago by representatives of the Y. W. C. A. revealed to them the fact well proven to those of us who are in close contact with young women that everywhere large numbers of young college women have two distinct and seemingly irreconcilable aims before them. They wish to marry and have children and they wish to be economically independent. When they think of marriage they confuse it with housewifery, and they have had enough chance to observe well organized business to recognize the waste and inefficiency and drudgery which often characterize the American home. Moreover, the financial side of domestic life is not alluring. They are too familiar with the dole system and the devious methods by which money is secured for even necessary household expenses, while the personal purse fares even worse. So over against the satisfactions of marriage and motherhood it is easy to place those of a professional or economic service which will not only give scope for special gifts and training, but give them financial independence. You may say that it is not the business of the college to meet this situation, but of society at large. I think, however, that there is much that the college can do both directly and indirectly to reconcile this seeming antagonism of interests, and thereby render a real service.

First, there should be a much franker recognition in the

college curriculum of the importance to the national welfare of sound family life than there now is. Instruction in economics, sociology, hygiene and ethics may well lay greater emphasis on training for the maintenance of that great social institution—the family. You can see, I think, the implication that there is much more involved for men than providing an income if they are to do their part, just as there is much more for women than cooking and sewing. This leads to another point which college work can help to emphasize, and that is the practice of outgrown household arts is no longer a measure of a woman's ability to manage a family or make a home. To some of us there is much in the present attitude of men and women toward domestic life that is both humorous and tragic (medicine and crocheting). Let more of the cooking go as the smoking of hams or roasting of coffee has gone. Let the making of garments follow weaving and spinning. Let soap-making disappear with candle dipping. Let the vacuum cleaner replace the broom. Let the bakery take the place it does all over Europe. Develop the commercial laundry on a scientific and efficient basis so that scrubbing at a washtub shall not longer be considered a necessary occupation for a woman who wishes to maintain a home. It is just as truly domestic to be a good buyer, to study methods of securing the manufacture of household supplies under conditions of health and justice to the workers and of eliminating wasteful practices in the distribution of household goods, and to take part in securing a wholesome food supply, progressive schools, adequate libraries, an efficient health service, decent places of amusement and recreation. I shall not attempt to enumerate those things which remain to be done in the home such as the care of the children and the planning of the budget. The point I want to make is that the college can do much to change the general attitude as to what constitutes domestic life even if it does not give specific training in every phase of it, and that it can give help and encouragement to those who under many difficulties are striving to find ways of helping young women during these



precious years of training to appreciate the social as well as family opportunities involved in domestic life. You see I am not now attempting to reconcile the two aims—that is too long a story and means that competition will have to give way to co-operation as the dominant factor in organized society. My belief is that some of the difficulty at least will disappear if domestic life is given more respect and honor.

The second problem is the outcome of granting suffrage to women. The Nineteenth Amendment has given to all women citizens of legal age a full share in the duty and responsibility of directing the course of the United States. The colleges have not yet fully realized, or perhaps I should say put into practice, their privilege of training young men for citizenship and here come these thousands of young women (over 50,000 in the state universities and colleges alone) who almost immediately will be called on to exercise the right of suffrage. Is not this an objective and ideal which is immediately pressing? The older women through the League of Women Voters, City Clubs and similar organizations are making active efforts to fit themselves for their new duties. They have a right to expect the colleges to add to their number year by year a new group ready to profit by experience and to grow into sound leadership for the masses whose privileges have not been as great. The preliminary training needed is not alone in the technique of government. It is needed much more in establishing a sense of honesty, integrity and service in college and community relations. The handling of funds for societies, fraternities, charitable undertakings and the like is too often carried on in loose and unbusinesslike ways. "Graft" should not be borne in a spirit of easy tolerance, but should be stamped out. Pledges to endowment funds, gifts to organized charitable undertakings should not be a measure of college spirit when a student is living on borrowed funds or drawing on the limited resources of a self-sacrificing family. Celebrations which take the form of damaging property and ignoring community rights, should be treated

like any case of public disorder. College students should not be allowed to consider themselves a special group exempt from the obligations of citizenship or in anywise different from other citizens exempt as their knowledge and training may contribute to their power as leaders. I wish we might eliminate the word "irresponsible" as a term to be generally applied to college youth. College faculties and the community generally take the fact for granted and the young people not only offer it as an excuse for neglect or inefficiency, but sometimes seem even to take pride in it.

I would like to have college women held to a higher standard of responsibility and achievement rather than to receive honor in proportion to the number of activities engaged in. Throughout, there is confusion as to loyalties, the smaller one too often crowding out the greater. I can only indicate the problem and suggest that some of the faculty promotions and rewards which are granted on the basis of a few pages of printed matter over which "Oblivion will soon stretch her wing" might as fitly be granted to those who show sympathy, judgment and foresight in helping train these young women to meet the issues of citizenship in later life. I am confident that we college people pay more attention to teaching subjects than to teaching people. How we can change our attitude and our method in the interests both of social advance and the higher learning, I shall not attempt to suggest.

I would emphasize then, family life and citizenship as proper objectives for the college today. I would remind you as a principle to be borne in mind in the collegiate education of women that "no civilization can remain the highest if another civilization adds to the intelligence of its men the intelligence of its women."

DR. C. R. MANN

It is a great pleasure to be back with the colleagues of my former years. I don't know whether I feel like the prodigal son being feasted on his return from the foreign land or whether I feel like a soldier who has just come back.

from the war. It is a great pleasure to be back in the fraternity with which I have lived so many years.

A great many problems have been put before the meeting this evening, and my mission here tonight is to find out, if possible, what this Association is interested in and what particular problems it has that the American Council on Education can assist in solving. We have had the question brought up of the over-crowding of colleges and the use of a means of selection to choose the right people. We have had the question of women's education brought before us. We have had a number of very striking criticisms of the American college presented. I am wondering if those are topics or fields of investigation or study that the American Council on Education might take up and help the colleges in co-ordinating their efforts in solving these problems.

I have felt as I have listened to the speeches this evening that an outsider in attending this meeting might have gained the impression that we were a rather hopeless crowd. I am not inclined to take that point of view of the college situation. We must recognize that we are living in a very confused period of our history. Even here in the quiet of this meeting we are surrounded with the emblems of a type of art that isn't altogether pleasing and in harmony with the training we have had. Between the words of the speakers come the sounds over on this side which indicate the type of music that is popular at the present time, not altogether the sort of music we like to have the young people enjoy. Yet that is what young people now live on, and we have to take them as they are.

The young men and women of this country are all right and the colleges are all right at heart. When they were presented with a great crisis, both the young men and women and the colleges came across in great shape. The thing that is necessary to make this country do a fine job is to give it a job that is worth doing.

Hence, the first question of the colleges is, What college job is worth doing. Then, when the colleges have found their mission and defined it clearly, they must answer the

question of what they can give the young people that is so much more worth doing than spending their evenings in rooms of this type and listening to the kinds of music going on in the next room, that they will prefer to work on the jobs the colleges give them.

In addition to the large problems that have already been suggested, I am going to state two or three of the national issues now before the country. I hope you will tell me how they affect your institution and whether they are issues that the Council on Education might well take up as its contribution to the education and development of the country.

The fundamental issue in education at the present time is the issue of continuing in the people the spirit of service and sacrifice that was demonstrated during the war. This country showed that when it has a real crisis to meet, it has character and stamina and manhood and womanhood that are able to meet any issue squarely and deal with it in a most effective manner. How can we keep that spirit alive? How can we keep it expressing itself in action in time of peace? Does it need a crisis to bring it forth? Are there not crises enough to be met in the affairs of everyday work to keep that spirit alive? This problem has been analyzed to a certain extent among the Federal Departments in Washington and certain definite steps have been taken to focus it more clearly and bring it more definitely before educational and other institutions of the country.

A few weeks ago there was held a conference on the subject of training youth, called, strange as it may seem, by the Secretary of War. The problem was defined by him to be one of national defense because that is the province of the Secretary of War. The country has now adopted a national policy with reference to military defense. That policy places the responsibility for the defense of this country militarily on a citizen army. It is the War Department's function to develop that citizen army and carry out the provisions of the act. The War Department has reached the conclusion that the development of the citizen army is fun-

dementally a problem of developing manhood and womanhood and that that problem is one over which the Federal Government has no control. Education is reserved by the Constitution to the States and to the people. The Federal Government must not take charge or control in any way.

The problem, therefore, is, what can be done to stimulate the people in the States and educational institutions to get a better conception of what American manhood and American womanhood should be and to shape their educational work accordingly. The conference recommended to the Secretary of War that three major lines of activity be instituted to bring that problem definitely and concretely before civilian agencies generally. One of those definite lines of attack deals with physical training, physical culture and health activity, because one of the major essential elements of an upstanding manhood is physical fitness. At the request of the Secretary of War, the Amateur Athletic Federation of America has undertaken the work of defining what constitutes physical fitness and of stimulating all kinds of civilian agencies to develop a better type of physical fitness throughout the country.

The second major division of the subject is the division of technical skill, the ability to do something useful for the country. The Conference recommended that there be organized a small board in Washington to be appointed by seven or eight major groups in this country that are interested in that particular matter to co-ordinate the various efforts and point out what are the main lines of attack that lead to fruitful results.

The third major element, as analyzed by the conference, is the question of loyalty and the spirit of service,—the desire to help your fellowman and to serve the community in which you live. Steps have been taken to organize a national council on this problem, composed of those employees in the Federal Government who are actively engaged in work that has a direct bearing on citizenship training or the development of the spirit of service. This council of federal employees will consist of the Commissioner



of Education, the Director of the Federal Board for Vocational Training, the Director of Rehabilitation Work in the Veterans' Bureau, the Director of the Bureau of Naturalization, the Director of States' Relations' Service in Agriculture, and others of that type. This Council may later be reinforced by a group of twelve or fifteen men and women who are not in governmental employ who will assist that federal council in establishing close contacts with civilian agencies outside of the Government in order to develop a better co-ordinated and better organized drive upon this subject of how to develop and keep alive the spirit of service in the American people.

Are the colleges interested in any or all of those questions? Would the colleges like to take part? They must take part. In what form do they want to take part in the solution of those three problems? Do you want the American Council to help co-ordinate the work of the colleges with the work of the Government in solving problems of that sort? It is expressions on questions of this sort that I am seeking here from the members of this conference.

There is only one major idea on which I am perfectly clear myself and which I shall take occasion to emphasize in the coming work, and that is that the fundamental lack of education at the present time is a failure to have clearly defined what it is trying to do. I say clearly defined because I have often said this and have been told, "Why, sure the colleges know what they are doing." We all can say very glibly, "Yes, we are turning out cultured gentlemen or cultured ladies, and it is scholarship we are after," and things of that sort. Those definitions are too vague. They do not enable you to reorganize your curriculum. They do not enable you to reorganize your chapel services, your student activities, so as to achieve the great objective of developing men and women with a sense of service.

Can we make a specific, clear-cut definition of what the college is for that will be a real guide in reorganizing the work so as to achieve these larger ideals? I am very well

satisfied that it can be done. It has been done in the Army since the war. The Army knows very clearly exactly what it is trying to do. Having set a very specific definition of its objective and having studied all the relations of the activities of the country to that objective, it knows very definitely that it ought to do such and such things. That definition of the objective in a very specific way—that analysis of all the relations of the Army to civilian agencies—has enabled the Army to make the greatest progress towards achieving its mission of national defense.

It seems to me the college problem is no more intricate and difficult than the problem of national defense. If the colleges would turn their minds really to the specific and detailed definition of their objectives, they would surely make rapid progress such as they have never known.

Therefore, in closing, let me again say I hope you will all tell me what your college problems are and what you would like to have the Council undertake. It is my hope that the Council can help you define specifically what it is you are trying to do. When that is specifically defined, the discovery of ways and means of improving the colleges and of obviating the criticisms that have been passed upon them will be relatively simple. But you must know specifically where you are going.

DR. H. C. MORRISON

Gentlemen, yesterday afternoon Dr. Kelly called me up at my office and asked me to come before this gathering to explain the work of the Educational Finance Inquiry; he didn't ask me to give an address on the cost of higher education, and I shall resist the temptation to do so.

Two or three years ago, two years ago this next month, in fact, a group of men gathered at the National Department of Superintendence meeting in Atlantic City, being very much concerned as to the increasing cost of education, took steps to inaugurate an inquiry and investigation

and an attempt, in a word, to find out what we, as a people, had let ourselves in for. That resulted in asking the National Council on Education to sponsor an investigation and in asking four of the Foundations to finance such an inquiry. A group of men got together in August, 1921, the scope of such an inquiry was canvassed and work was begun in September. The first stages of that inquiry are now approaching completion. Of course, you will appreciate the fact that the undertaking is a huge one and even though the money made available for our purposes was generous, it would be wholly impossible in a brief time to survey in any very thoroughgoing way on a national scale this immensely large problem, especially in view of the fact that it is exceedingly difficult to find educational institutions and especially public school systems which have accounts from which the probable cost of the next decade or two can be predicted.

The Commission finally decided to confine itself to certain phases, hoping to do a good job in that respect and in that way to induce further investigation, possibly by the same Commission but hopefully by a good many other similar types of inquiry. For that reason it addressed itself in the first place to an intimate study of the educational finances in the State of New York and that part of the investigation is approaching completion. We should have a publication in print sometime next fall at the latest. We haven't attempted and we don't propose to attempt to survey the cost of higher education or of elementary education or any part of education in any comparative sense. We have set before us the single task for the present of trying to find out on the basis of the program as at present laid out, what the whole program would cost if on the basis of present conditions it were carried out. We can keep our feet on pretty firm ground up to that extent.

We have also inaugurated a similar inquiry in the State of Illinois. Only some of the more fundamental problems in this state can be studied. Similarly a rather complete study will be made in the State of Iowa and in the State

of California. President Elliott of Purdue University is overseeing a group of men who are studying the problem of the cost of higher education, in both tax-supported and endowed institutions, in the same sense in which the public schools have been and are being studied: namely, attempting to count the cost and attempting to see what the cost prospect is, the program being what it is.

The private institutions are interested. It isn't, I think, at all to be considered that the tax-supported institutions are the only ones which make a drain on the public purse. Those of us who are working in endowed institutions are in the same boat with our friends in the tax-supported institutions and in the same boat with the public school system. The truth of the matter is, financially considered, that about the only difference between a state university and a great endowed university or endowed college is in the fact that the executive officers of the state universities can sometimes persuade a legislature to give them by legislative enactment a title to a certain portion of the social income, while the endowed institutions persuade rich men and others to create endowment which in its turn creates titles to certain portions of the social income. Year by year the whole program from kindergarten to university has to be supported out of the social income for that year or from balances which have been carried from previous years.

The critical part of the situation is the one to which President Rhees has referred. We have been accustomed in days gone by to look upon the cost of education as being something in the nature of a pyramid. It had a huge base, a huge number of children in the elementary schools. The sides rapidly drew in even during the elementary school period. They drew in still more rapidly during the secondary period, and the apex of the pyramid was very small. The influx of students in higher institutions is rapidly turning the pyramid into a prism. The slope is less and less marked. Of course, the important thing is that it is the upper end of that pyramid which is the expensive part,—

the cost of secondary, higher and professional education. Now the tendency has been to expand the American dogma of free and universal education almost without limit, so that we find, as you know, in various parts of the country, the theory set up that a citizen is entitled not only to elementary education at public expense, but to secondary and higher education at public expense, and even professional education at public expense. That may all be perfectly sound politics, very likely it is, but the fundamental question is, how much is it all going to cost, and how much of a drain upon our annual income are we willing to endure. The nation certainly cannot carry out its educational program without sacrifice. It is eminently desirable that we shall not go on with our eyes closed, with no idea of what sacrifice is implied.

The finance inquiry has received the most cordial co-operation, I think, from all of the Associations of this sort with which we have up to this time had occasion to come in contact, notably, of course, the representatives of tax-supported institutions, state universities, land grant colleges, normal schools, and so on. I am very confident, although I have no special request to make this evening, that as time goes on either this Commission or its successor will probably appear before your body asking a similar co-operation from you in the pursuit of this fundamental problem which is common to all institutions.



REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE  
ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE  
CURRICULUM\*

DR. ROBERT L. KELLY, Chairman

This is not a formal report of the Commission. It is a series of observations by individuals. The subject matter of the addresses has not been coordinated except that there is a common theme. No speaker knows what the others are about to say.

In the two preceding reports certain facts bearing upon the *materials* of the college curriculum were set forth, the discussions being conducted with special reference to tendencies since the World War and to the emphases given to *departmental* activities. Four general conclusions have been reached—(1) that the curriculum of the liberal colleges is becoming *simplified* as indicated by the decreasing number of major departments, and that this simplification is largely the result of the expression of *student preference* and not of faculty prescription; (2) that it is becoming *humanized* in that increasingly the more modern material with social content is being substituted for the older “disciplinary” and “cultural” material; (3) that it is becoming *individualized* in that while English is the master subject in practically every institution and such subjects as French and chemistry nearly always follow in immediate or close succession, the total number of subjects taught in all American colleges is very large and they are distributed among the colleges presumably with reference to individual disposition and character. It has also been shown (4) that among the detached colleges in general, and even among the liberal arts colleges, with rare exceptions, in great universities situated in the metropolitan centers, the curriculum is *not* becoming *vocationalized*. Whatever motive liberal college students may have, most of them are not immediately concerned with professional and technical subjects.

\*In response to the request of a large number of college presidents, the report and discussion on the college curriculum have been printed in pamphlet form and may be obtained at the rate of 15 cents each or eight for \$1.00, from the office of the Association, 111 Fifth Ave., New York City.

At the same time, (5) it has been brought out that while the liberal college is still striving to be primarily a place of *orientation*, the more fundamental and *unifying* subjects are increasingly conspicuous by their absence from the curriculum.

This year the Commission addresses itself to the very complicated and difficult task of inquiring what steps have been taken or may be taken to change the interest of curriculum builders from the traditional process of dealing with *materials* as segregated in separate departments to the apparently more vital process of dealing with *methods of study* and *functional values* in the curriculum as a whole.

It is unnecessary to attempt to account for the confusion which has arisen through the former method of curriculum building, a method, as our investigations indicate, which is still the dominant one. A careful scrutiny of the program of study of most of the colleges indicates that they are constructed very much as a tariff bill is constructed in the Congress of the United States. The final result is the outcome of certain strains and tensions, of concessions and exchanges as between departmental representatives. The evidences that unifying principles are actually functioning in the development of the college curriculum are difficult to discover.

Undoubtedly the influence of the free elective system as it has operated in the past and the analytic tendencies of the newer scientific subjects have been strong factors in producing the present state of confusion. The possible material for study in a liberal college has developed altogether beyond the point where any student may ever be expected to comprehend it in four years' time. The problem thus offered has been very largely that of designating *certain subjects* as inherently necessary for a college degree. The extent to which the materials for the degree have been selected for their supposedly inherent value can only be appreciated if one seriously devotes himself for a series of weeks to a study of college catalogues. The student is impressed as this study goes on that the catalogues indicate

very little *curriculum-mindedness* and very large *department-mindedness*, on the part of curriculum builders.

The specific question which is raised in this report, therefore, is—Has the curriculum material become so enriched that for this reason alone, if not for other reasons, an effort to unify the curriculum on the basis of materials is impossible and should give place to the effort to unify along functional lines, with the frankly implied admission that in neither event will complete unification be obtained by the college student?

It may be pointed out at the beginning that in the four tendencies of the curriculum which have already been referred to—that is, the tendency toward simplification, toward socialization, toward individualization, as well as in the tendency to maintain a non-vocational attitude, there is a functional element which is largely responsible for the tendency. The students *express preference* for certain subjects. Most of them *prefer modern* subjects. They *prefer* subjects related to *individual* motives. They *seek* the realization of *liberal* rather than professional *motives*. The questions before us then are specifically, What provision are the colleges making for the practical realization of these preferences, or, What provision may the college make for their more successful realization?

In order, if possible, to find the answers to these questions, sixty colleges, members of the Association, were selected at random on three different bases. Approximately twenty colleges were selected which are accredited by the Association of American Universities, twenty others which are accredited by various regional standardizing agencies, and a third group of twenty which have not been accredited either by the Association of American Universities or the regional standardizing agencies. They are accredited by State agencies. A few are included in the last list from the approved list of the University of California.

*Class A, Accredited by the Association of American Universities:* Amherst, Haverford, Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, Leland Stanford, Northwestern, University of Penn-

sylvania, Pomona, Grinnell, Vanderbilt, College of St. Catherine, Washington & Lee, Knox, Carleton, Hamilton, Oberlin, Lafayette, Randolph Macon Woman's, Earlham.

*Class B, Accredited by various regional standardizing agencies:* Mills, University of Denver, Butler, Parsons, Otterbein, Transylvania, Emporia, St. Olaf, Westminster, Mo., Nebraska Wesleyan, Adelphi, Davidson, Baylor, Hiram, Wittenberg, Franklin & Marshall, Huron, Campion, Muhlenberg, Lebanon Valley.

*Class C, Not accredited by either the Association of American Universities or the regional standardizing agencies:* Judson, Hendrix, Connecticut College for Women, Whittier, George Washington, Wesleyan Female, Hedding, Evansville, Kansas Wesleyan, Berea, Hood, Hope, Concordia, Minn., Central Wesleyan, Mo., Salem, Bluffton, University of Tulsa, Fisk, Trinity, Texas.

Two preliminary steps were taken in the effort to answer the questions before us. Effort was made first to discover the various grouping systems announced in the catalogues of these institutions, together with the possible bases for grouping; and secondly, effort was made to ascertain the prescribed requirements for the Bachelor's degree.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is found that all colleges in each of the three classes have some kind of grouping system. It is assumed that this means some type of effort at unifying the curriculum, or at least parts of it. The prevailing number of groups is three or four, and this statement applies to each of the three classes of colleges taken for illustrative purposes. The three fundamental groups may be designated by the representative titles—Language, Science and Philosophy. Ordinarily, when there are four groups the Language group is broken up into English and Foreign Language. There are some variations in each group—for instance, Smith College in *Class A* has nine groups; Baylor University in *Class B* has eleven groups, and the Central Wesleyan College, Mo., in *Class C* has six groups. While there is no great variation between the classes as to the number of groups,

there is much variation as to their content and meaning. The first impression one gets from a study like this is that the definitions, usages and purposes of the different colleges are so multiform and varied that simplification is well nigh impossible. However, it is to be said that in the colleges belonging to *Class A* there is a relative degree of simplicity which has been evolved from the apparently hopeless complexity. The term "group" is used by the colleges in no less than ten different ways. The unusual methods of grouping are found, for the most part, in *Class C* and *Class B*.

(1) There are colleges which still adhere to the A.B., Ph.B., and B.S. groups, and which stipulate the numbers of the courses within those several groups. (*Class B*).

(2) There are colleges which still hold to the old classical, English, modern language, Latin, science, history and mathematics groups, and that require specifically most of the work within the given group. (*Classes B and C*).

(3) Then there is the division into a general group, major group and the elective group. (*Class C*).

(4) Some colleges arrange their prescribed studies in groups from which the student is required to take definite work, as indicated. (*Class C*).

(5) On the other hand, there are colleges which classify their electives as group electives and free electives. (*Class C*).

(6) There are colleges outside this study which refer in their catalogues to the upper-class group and the lower class group. (California, Chicago).

(7) There is what is known as a "Group Major," which carries with it an examination over a field of study and over three courses forming a well unified field of study taken in the same year, together with outside reading. (*Class A*).

(8) There are outside this study what are called "Major Groups" within divisions of which there are usually three. (Williams and the University of Colorado).

(9) Bryn Mawr outside this study designates studies in



the catalogue not as belonging to a class but as belonging to a group, and for this purpose the college has devised 71 different groups.

(10) Finally, *there is the group which is made up presumably of related subjects and which may be used definitely for functional purposes in assisting the student in the effort to relate his studies and unify his curriculum throughout.* (Classes A and B).

The discovery is made that there are very few colleges which surrender themselves to the functional philosophy of the group as just stated in (10). Almost without exception in addition to the various groups the colleges have definitely stipulated *requirements for graduation*, and these stipulations for the most part constitute a system which runs parallel to the grouping system. For instance, at Smith, which has nine groups, there are also nine types of requirements for graduation. St. Olaf announces eleven different types of requirements for the degree. Campion and Wesleyan, Ga., have subject requirements for each of the degrees—A.B., B.S., and Ph.B. Denver has a major-minor system, a group system with *restrictions* and a statement of prescribed courses, ten hours of which, except in English, *may be waived!* As has been said, the colleges, almost without exception, have certain definite requirements for the degree and these requirements are stated as definitely in terms of *curriculum material*. In range they require from one-third to three-fourths of the work for a degree. The group system is largely undefined and very loosely enforced, or not enforced at all. As a matter of fact, the colleges as a class have never put the group system to the test, as a means of unifying the students' curriculum. Two or three colleges have successfully done so.

If the question be asked, therefore, what the purpose of the grouping system is, the prevailing answer seems to be as is definitely stated by Hiram College, that it is "for convenience in reference." There are a few colleges (Earlham, Carleton, University of Pennsylvania) which rely very largely on the group system in conjunction with the major-

minor system and a system of faculty advisors for steering the student through his college course. That is to say, the groups are under control and actually function, although even in the college which best illustrates this principle, there is still lingering a definitely stated requirement of four semester hours of English composition. In the case of most institutions examined, the groups are not intended to function in that form but are stated to explain to the student the reason for prescribed courses and to aid in forming the educational philosophy with which he may build his curriculum. They function as a *deterrent* to a miscellaneous curriculum by the mere statement that they are proof of balance, but in most cases they remain in the status of an explanation. The faculty has worked out a curriculum desirable for the students, expressed it in certain prescribed subjects in semester hours, and given the student the group statement as the reason. The student, however, is to be governed by the curriculum formulated and may or may not be concerned, much less guided, by the group statement which becomes rather academic. The faculties do not live and the students are not guided immediately by the group systems.

The faculties of numerous institutions have recently been attempting to assist the student in unifying his curriculum by means of various types of coordinating or orientation courses. A statement of these courses as offered to or required of Freshmen is given in the October, 1922, issue of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors. Committee G of that Association also discusses these courses at considerable length and makes recommendations. It is enough to say here that of the eight purposes underlying those several courses which Committee G has discovered, five of them are efforts to unify the *materials* of the curriculum. One is intended to endeavor to train the student in *thinking*. The others are *administrative*. In an indirect way, it may be said that all of them have functional value in that it is the hope that the courses may result in defining for the Freshmen more definitely their own major

interests. At the same time, as has been suggested, the general emphasis is upon content and not on functional values. In addition to these coordinating courses for Freshmen there are being introduced into numerous colleges orientation courses for upper-class men, the purpose of which is to assist them in formulating a philosophy of life. These courses have the advantage of dealing with materials with which the student is somewhat more familiar than he could possibly be in the earlier stage of his college career. Their purpose, however, is to put into operation at last a process that has been largely ignored in the earlier years of college study. They constitute a cap placed on top of the shock—I assume that you are all farmers—for protection against the wind and the weather in the world of real life which the student has to enter after leaving the world of things academic.

A demand may fairly be made of the Commission that it state a practicable plan by which an effort functionally to unify each student's curriculum may be achieved. It appears that it is possible to submit such a plan merely by synthesizing what has been abstracted in years of experimentation. The free elective system had the plan *implicit* in it but failed because it allowed experience to run riot. The plan in all of its details is not found operative at present in any single institution of which the Commission has knowledge, but all phases of the plan—the mere skeleton of which is now given—are *operating satisfactorily in the institutions here considered*. I am not suggesting another experiment, but reporting (unsynthesized) experience. There is in a few colleges a relating of the (1) group system, the (2) major-minor system and the (3) faculty advisory system which when actually put into operation accomplishes a large part of the purpose proposed. If there were added to this (4) some device for insuring cumulative study as is being done in the honors courses, the *outline of the machinery* of the system would be fully stated. (a) The groups are made up on a basis as natural as that which draws groups of faculty men together to lunch in the

faculty club rooms. (b) The major-minor system is enforced in such a way as to provide both *concentration* and *distribution*. (c) And both systems just referred to are so flexible that the faculty advisor and the student work out a program which is *individual* from the student point of view, and, of course, *corporate* from the point of view of the college, and *social* from the point of view of both. (d) The Freshman or Sophomore furnishes initial enthusiasms and purposes upon which the system is built, and if these cannot be discovered outside of athletics and "student activities," the faculty should be sure that the fault is not their own rather than the student's. In his address at New Haven before the American Historical Association recently, Secretary Hughes in speaking upon the Washington Conference said, "I believe in conferences, but I do not believe there is much hope of success in a conference *as such*. The reason why the Washington Conference was successful was because a group of men came together who had common desires and purposes and who were intent upon solving common problems." This is a chapter from real life. Student activities are also chapters from real life. A method must be discovered by which student and teacher will have common desires and be bent upon the solution of common problems. The vocational schools have solved this problem. Is a college education, *as such*, so desirable as a college education which is related to vital interests?

For, of course, an effort to unify the college curriculum on a functional basis is merely an effort to realize the philosophy of interest in the college domain. The effort recognizes that *method is more important than subject matter* in that it is more related to life's problems immediately and more serviceable for the problems which are to come. It recognizes that *thinking* is a different process from *acquiring knowledge*, but it does not underestimate scholarship for it recognizes that knowledge is more secure if it is the result of skill in study and is in response to vital motives. It attempts to find within each student a response to aims as fundamental as were the War aims in the S. A. T. C.

formulated in an hour of national emergency. It undertakes to discover equally fundamental constructive aims, to realize the *moral equivalent* not of war but of the *vocational motive* which characterizes the professional and technical school. It undertakes to maintain *ideals* along with *ideas*. It introduces the student into real life early in his college career and affords opportunity to the teacher to become a creator instead of a crammer. It is intended to make a liberal college in truth as well as in name a college of arts.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I am to make a few disconnected remarks as a member of the Commission on the things that have been said by the chairman. We have not had very much conference together and I am afraid you will not discover very much connection at least in what I am going to say, if I can remember what I am going to say. In general I should say that I find myself quite in agreement with what he calls the functional point of view. The outstanding fact of that apparently is a hatred of departments. Along that line I am willing to go as far as any one will go and then try to go a little farther. I should not, however, I think, be inclined to substitute for the department the group.

In so far as the argument rests upon the notion of the group, I should probably find myself somewhat out of sympathy with the chairman. In place of the department it would seem to be desirable not to substitute the group but the curriculum as a whole. Again, as you will see, if I can develop my thought at all, I shall be somewhat in fear of taking the individual students as the basis from which we shall determine our educational procedure. If it could be done at all, I think I should like to substitute the community for the individual student so to ask the question whether it is possible to get the unity which we are seeking in terms of the community as a whole and in terms of the teaching task as a whole as it appears in the curriculum of the community. Our question is how we can get unity in the cur-



riculum. Well, I think probably we would all agree in the first place (it is very desirable that we should, since it is a truism of modern logic, as I suppose it was of ancient logic) that a thing is understood only so far as it is unified. It makes no difference how much you have it in your mind, it makes no difference how much information you have with regard to it, it makes no difference what you know about it, so far as our logicians have anything to tell us about the nature of thinking their fundamental insight in ancient and modern times is this: To understand is to unify. In so far as the mind is not unified it does not understand, and the one thing to be said about our modern curriculum so far as we find it lacking in unity is just this: It is not an instrument of understanding. In so far as our students have not a unified body of knowledge as a whole they don't understand. In so far as our teachers have not unified their interpretation of experience as a whole, they do not understand the experience. In so far as modern education has become a thing of shreds and patches, has become a thing of departments, groups and interests and problems and subjects, just so far, if logic knows what it is talking about, our modern teaching, our modern curriculum, is not a thing of intelligent insight.

How, then, shall we achieve unity in our teaching? A curriculum is a curriculum; it is a plan of teaching; it is a scheme of instruction only in so far as it is a unified thing. What we have now as a result of our elective manipulation is not education in the sense in which a college of liberal arts understands that term.

The first question is: Can we afford, as the elective system does, to leave the task of unification to the individual student? Can we let the student take his choice of subjects and then leave it with him to work out the unity for himself? I don't think that is on the face of it so absurd a proposition as it seems. After all what you do with these subjects when you put them into the minds of the students is to put them into a mind, at least you suppose you do. I suppose that the underlying premise of all our elective

procedure was that the thing into which you put the studies is a mind. And we trusted that that mind whose dominating law is unification would take those separate things and make of them a unitary scheme. Of course, we know where the elective system failed. It failed in the supposition that the students' are active minds, because they are not. They don't function in any active sense, they don't unify in any thorough way. What they do is just to stop when we stop pushing; and nothing happens. The essential difficulty on the part of the college with regard to the American student is that the mind of the American student doesn't work, it just stops when you give it something to do. It is not an active attempt at understanding the experience of the human race, which is what the elective systems suppose it to be.

The mind of the American teacher is not in that sense a mind either. The teacher in the American college can not adequately be described as a person who is attempting to unify the content of human experience. He too is described either in terms of what he doesn't do or in terms of the special limitation of what he does. So I think I shall have to record here my lack of faith in the American student as he is. We can't take him as giving promise of the proper unification of the college curriculum. Then what shall we take? Here it seems to me that the American college faces just the same situation that the American people as a whole face. We have before us the task of making a community. I think the great difficulty, the great problem of our American life is not the problem of the individual, it is the problem of the community, the problem of making out of groups of people genuine, interrelated, interacting, unified spiritual bodies which have some sort of common experience and which live in terms of that experience so that every individual finds the major part of his interests and his experience coming out of the life of the community. I think the question is with regard to our colleges how they can be made into communities. There are not communities enough in terms of our elective system. Can they be made into genuine community enterprises? How

can it be done? I think it must be done. What does the college stand for in the mind of the student? What does he find it to be?

The under-graduate life has certain dominating interests and motives which rather easily make it a single thing which the student can understand and grasp and share in. But what does the college as a thing of the spirit and a thing of the mind mean for him as a unitary thing? Well, if you say it means a place in which he should study, I don't think you have gotten very far, because different people are studying different things and there doesn't seem to be any particular common reason why they should study these different things. The things don't fuse together into any common purpose. I don't believe our boy going to an American college knows very well what you mean when you tell him he ought to study. It is very much like a formal requirement imposed by older people.

What can we put into the community as a principle underlying the demand for study on our part which will give that thing the compelling force of a community drive, a community enterprise, a something by which he as a member of the community must be dominated and carried away and inspired, in terms of which he must live? Here I think we are getting on controversial ground and very dangerous ground, and I imagine our differences would begin to appear very quickly. In the first place, I don't believe you can give him a body of opinions which he must accept. I don't believe that the American college any more than the American community can be dominated by a set of opinions which every member of the community is supposed to accept. Personally, I believe that the very life of a college depends upon the fact that its different members hold different opinions, and upon all essential matters they must not agree in their opinions; they must not agree about religion, they must not agree about politics, they must not agree about morals, they must not agree in matters of taste, they must not agree about anything that is essential to human life as getting the stuff out of which it is made. Any at-

tempt to make a community in those terms seems to me not only false in principle but sure to end very quickly in disaster. In the last resort the college is a place of study, of investigation, of discussion, and when people are studying and investigating and discussing they differ. Difference is the very breath of the spirit of an institution of learning, and I prophesy that any institution which attempts to be an institution of learning in terms of the acceptance of certain points of view, of certain attitudes which are to be taken by all the members of the community—any community that attempts that will end in disaster.

I tell you the one way to make young people differ with you is to try to make them agree with you. Every time you try it you will get what you deserve in terms of your result. You can't take the young American who wants to study or has it in him to study and say, "You come to this community and believe this." He will go to another community or else he will come to yours and believe something else. I know it. That is what he ought to do if he is going to be a person who thinks.

Just here, if I may be allowed to remark on what was said last night, I think we must not take too seriously the suggestion that we should try to repeat the experience of the war. The analogy of the war is a rather dangerous one for time of peace, and I think we had better beware of it. For a long time we have been seeking in time of peace the moral equivalent of war. We want that in our education. But there is something to be remembered; namely, the moral equivalent of war is hell. You can't escape it. If you get or try to get in time of peace the sort of unification of a community which is necessary in time of war, you will get war over again. Let's look back on it and say the truth. In time of war you fool yourself, in time of war you hate, in time of war you commit people to ideas and notions which they don't really believe, in time of war you use ideas and statements of ideas as tools and instruments with which to fight, in time of war you lie for the sake of the victories to be gained. We can't organize intellectual communities on

any such basis in time of peace. You have got to organize in time of peace not in terms of ideas which everybody accepts as the truth but in terms of certain common enterprises in which everybody takes part, not as one who accepts a dictum but as one who shares in an attempt. So I say again, what is the attempt? What is the attempt to be made by the college which has enough in it to seize upon all the members of the community and drive them frantic with the zeal for this common thing for which the community stands? Well, now, I feel as though I were about to drop my scale, because after all peace isn't so exciting as war, after all it isn't easy to get something into the class room that is as exciting as a football game—but that is what we are after, that is what we have got to get.

The only thing I can give you, the only thing I can give to students is this: A college should be a place in which every member of the community is attempting to understand what goes on in human life, and I shall give as the limiting principle of a college of liberal arts this: I don't believe anybody has a right to be in the college of liberal arts either as teacher or pupil whose primary interest is not that he is trying to understand human experience as a whole, that is, trying to get hold of human life as an enterprise of the human spirit and to so construe it in terms of his mind that he can take his part better in that enterprise. If we could put that in terms of an examination that is the kind of examination I would like. If any boy or girl wanted to engage in the task of understanding human experience as a whole so he might live it better, I would take him in. If we found out he didn't want that, I would put him out. If anybody has a subject he studies or wants to teach in such a way that it gives better understanding of what men are trying to do and ought to be trying to do, if he has a subject that he can teach and wants to teach in that way, I would have him as a teacher in a liberal college; if he hasn't, I would put him out, he hasn't any place.

There is our question. Can we as communities which are engaged in the liberal enterprise of attempting to make all



of human experience into some sort of unified understanding, can we take our communities, these little communities that on the whole we represent, can we take these few hundreds of individuals, students and pupils and fuse them altogether into some such single thing by which the whole community may be dominated? Well, now, if we are to do it, I think there is only one way to do it, and that is just to do it. I for one am ready to pledge my faith. If necessary I am willing to chuck the whole body of machinery overboard and start again.

In this connection I think there is a very notable experiment being made, the experiment at Reed College. I don't know how that experiment is going to turn out, I don't suppose they do there either, but what I am sure of is that at Reed College they are very deliberately and very explicitly trying just this thing. Whether they succeed or not in making it go, at least I am pretty sure they are trying the right thing. If they don't make it go this time perhaps they will make it go the next; if they don't make it go perhaps somebody else will make it go. At any rate in one form or another they seem to me to be trying the essential thing.

From another point of view, may I state what I think that thing needs? I should be willing to state the use of a curriculum in these two terms: It seems to me this curriculum should fall into two parts; the first is the part of taking a representative body of knowledge, representative of the whole field of knowledge in all its aspects, the science which gives a description of the natural process which surrounds and determines human life; the arts, which express its value of experiences, including literature; the history, which gives an account of the development of human life; the social and economic studies which give an account of its institutions; the philosophy which gives an account of the value and motives and the underlying beliefs and presuppositions upon which the whole thing rests. I believe there is one part of our curriculum where there should be selection, proper selection from those fields and that all students

should take the same subjects as so selected. In my own opinion it is pretty essential that in the first two years of the college course we should have a completely required curriculum, or practically that. There might be the substitution of one language for another, but it seems to me that in our first two years we should do as they are doing at Reed now and doing at some other places to a very large extent. We should take the outline of human experience as determined by our various studies of it, approaching it from the different aspects, and we as a college faculty should make such selection from those studies as to make by the combining of the selection something like an outline view of human experience.

Now, of course, we wouldn't give all of human experience. Naturally we would give only selections. But we would give those selections in such a way as to make them fit in together, one with the other, and to make them all round out together into a single scheme. I would like to see every Freshman and Sophomore in a college course engaged in the same piece of work from the beginning of that first year to end of the second, and I would like to have him know that the community of which he is a member regards it as essential for the sort of intelligence in which the community believes, that he as a member of the community shall master that material, shall get started on that enterprise. We are not going to make him believe he has finished the enterprise, we are not going to make him believe in those two years that his teachers tell him what there is to be known about human experience. It seems to me the first or one of the first things we need to do along that line is to diminish the importance of the teacher. There is another failure and folly of our elective system. We have altogether exalted the importance of the teacher too much. We have made pupils think that what the teacher has to tell them is a very important matter. I think that what we ought to tell our pupils is that what a teacher thinks about a subject is probably very unimportant. If I am trying to teach philosophy what difference does it make to

a student what I think about the problem of evil or the nature of the categorical judgment? If he wants to get an opinion that is important about the problem of evil or the categorical judgment, he can go to Aristotle or Comte or Hegel or Spinoza or Lotze, let him go to somebody that knows something about it, not a teacher in an American college. (Laughter).

Let us realize that there are hundreds and thousands of us all over this American country who will never be heard of after a few years are gone past; it is not our business to produce students like ourselves, it is the business of the American college to stop the sentimental hero worship in which teachers have gloated, having impressed themselves on the plastic minds so they stick there forever and keep it a mediocre thing as long as it exists. It is the business of the teacher to introduce students, if he can, to the great minds of human history, get students acquainted with literature.

One of the greatest criticisms that is to be made of the American college today is that it doesn't teach pupils to read. They think they will learn it from their teacher. But what you and I must know is that our job in those first two years at least is to get the lot of young people interested in the task of trying to understand what human life is and then get them introduced to the great body of human experience and human wisdom and human knowledge and human thought that has been coming down through the ages and is going on into the ages, to get them engaged in the task of sharing that, not taking what we can give them.

Now I believe it is the task of the first two years for us to say to the boys and girls, "You have got to engage in that enterprise, and nothing else, you are not going to study chemistry, physics, economics, bookkeeping or anything else, you are going to try to become a part in the great endeavor of the human mind to understand itself and its world. You are all to be engaged in the same piece of work."

Then I would not simply as a concession but also as a matter of principle, if they have done that during the first

two years, turn each one of them loose into some special field and let him find out what the thing really feels like when you are doing something for yourself. Of course they will all go into their separate groups and try to learn what the technique of thinking is. At the same time it seems to me they ought to be kept with enough of the common work, with the sort of Senior course to which Dr. Kelly referred, to keep the whole community bound together by the single enterprise, which, after all, is the enterprise of an institution of learning and insight, the enterprise of understanding.

If you will let me say a word in conclusion, I will tell you what is the trouble with the whole business. (I think I have given five or six explanations already of what is the chief trouble and I want to give another.) It is the way we do. Of course, the chief trouble with our teaching—you as presidents of colleges know it, and I know it, everybody that deals with American life knows it—today is that we haven't anything to teach. That is why we teach chemistry and physics and botany and economics and mathematics and all the rest; we haven't wisdom to teach. We don't know what to say about life today as our fathers did. We haven't got the whole body of the curriculum bound together in terms of a single enterprise in which we are engaged, in which we could take our pupils. You know as well as I do whether you are trying to hold on to the old scheme or not, you know as well as I do that under the rush of modern time with the incoming of the big bodies of knowledge and the new forms of intellectual technique that the old structure of interpretation of human life is wrecked, it has lost its unity, it has lost its power. America today, like the countries of Europe and the rest of the world, America particularly, doesn't know what to think about any of the essential features of our human experience. We are lost and mixed up and bewildered, and if you ask what is the matter with our young people, it is just because they know it in their bones, whether they know it with their minds or not, we haven't got a gospel, a philosophy, we haven't in

the proper sense of the term a religion to give them. So we touch it here and we touch it there and try to make them believe things that we don't believe ourselves, and we try to make them do things that we don't know are essential. We are lost in the maze that faces us today as an American people of gathering together again the fragments of our experience, the theories of our life, the parts of our knowledge, and making out of them again a scheme of life by which people may go on in some sort of command of their old faith.

And so I say to the members of this body what seems to me to be very, very important. I think upon us very largely rests this responsibility, for in my opinion the small college in America more than any other institution is going to meet that demand. We are committed to the liberal enterprise. In our institutions we have to do a thing that it seems impossible to do and yet which must be done if this American life of ours is to be lived with anything like success, and in the carrying on of that work the small college, the small liberal college, stands as the greatest hope of our people.

I will tell you what our task is. [Our task as the leaders and as members of small colleges is to engage again in the attempt to make a philosophy of life or a religion, if that is what you call it, a scheme of values, a settled belief, a formulation of questions, a feeling of enterprises and appreciations out of which human life may be made a significant and beautiful and splendid thing.] That is what we have got to do chiefly in our colleges and we mustn't try to give that to our students. What we must try to do with the youngsters that come up is to take them in with us and tell them we are trying to make it and they must try to make it and the college must seethe with the enthusiasm of that attempt to make out of life a beautiful and significant thing. But what is essential to all of that is the making of teachers, teachers for American youth. We haven't teachers enough, teaching has fallen away into mere instruction. We have got to make teachers who can take hold of the



youth of America and lead them into the beauty and significance and meaning not only of American life but of human life as an essentially beautiful thing.

---

*A Course in International Relations*

MISS MARGARET C. ALEXANDER

It is a very great privilege to have a part in this conference on the Organization of the College Curriculum—and it is for me a novel experience to sit above the salt, as it were. Heretofore my associations in this connection have always been with the student. I have been for some time very much interested in the growing recognition, on the part of faculty and student alike, of the need for such changes in our educational method as will lead away from the old hit-or-miss practice of steeping the student's mind in apparently unrelated bits of information—what I heard a student at Swarthmore College call “a heterogeneous conglomeration of dissociated miscellanies”—to an organized plan of study, designed to develop the student's critical faculties, to stimulate his intellectual curiosity, to vitalize his studies by linking them up with the world he lives in, and last of all, to make him see the sum total of human knowledge as a unified whole, made up not of isolated but of distinctly interrelated fields. The adoption at Smith College and at Swarthmore College of the English system of reading for honors, is a healthy manifestation of this tendency to unify the curriculum. The introduction of such courses as that in Contemporary Civilization at Columbia University, a Freshman compulsory course with the express purpose of “raising for consideration the insistent problems of the present,” and of the Freshman course at Amherst in social and economic institutions which is designed (and here I quote President Meiklejohn) “to make students at the very beginning aware of the moral, social and economic scheme—the society—of which they are members” will do something to supply the vitality which a group of students from a dozen or more colleges in the East and Middle West, as-

sembled in conference during these last Christmas holidays, accused the college of lacking. The indictment of the college of today is grave—to cram minds rather than to make them, to stifle intellectual curiosity rather than to awaken it, and to detach young men and women from life rather than to give them an earnest consciousness of their relation to it—this is serious; but it would be even more so if it were not for such evidence of dissatisfaction on the part of the students as the discussions at the conference of which I speak, and the remarkable curriculum proposals made by the Student Curricular Committee of Barnard College last year. The correctives suggested by the students bear the ear-marks of immaturity, but they are none the less significant. It remains for a body like this, of men and women who have given years of attention to the question of college and university education, to work out a practical program of curricular reform.

So much for the general problem. I hesitate to proceed, for in running over a collection of addresses made by the speaker before me on the question of "The Liberal College" I found these words: "Courses are the chimeras of an imagination perverted by the categories of mechanics." And yet the burden of my paper this morning is a course, a course in international relations. Montesquieu has said, "Knowledge humanizes mankind, and reason inclines to mildness, but prejudices eradicate every tender disposition." And yet perhaps in no other branch of human relations, not even excluding domestic politics, are prejudices more rampant than in the relations of those aggregates of human beings we call nations. Here crowd-thinking gets in its prettiest, or ugliest, work. Blind obedience to a shibboleth leads men to cast aside reason and, under pressure of crisis, to indulge in the stupidest and most anti-social of human performances—war. It is true that most college students, like most men and women, if asked whether they considered war desirable, would answer in the negative. Some would add in the next breath, however, somewhat in the strain of Santayana, when he talks of the dilemma democ-

racy and culture create for each other, that war can never be abolished "until some purified and high-bred race succeeds the promiscuous bipeds that now blacken the planet." Others, making the wish father to the thought, will find great cause for optimism in each fresh recruit that is brought into the pacifist fold, and will think that if they repeat the Coué formula "Ce passe" with sufficient faith, they will wake up some fine morning and find war a thing of the past. Peace, however, is not an end in itself. Nor will outlawing war or merely calling it undesirable, or mad, or criminal, put an end to it. Peace is a realizable ideal only as the conditions which make for war are faced and dealt with. It is to make known these conditions and to inquire into possible ways of removing them that a systematic and scientific study of international relations is desirable.

International relations are, of course, already treated in some form or other in a great many colleges, but the treatment is either incidental to the general subject under consideration or limited in approach. Courses in modern European history almost without exception deal with such questions as the rise of nationalism, the development of modern imperialism, and the wars of the last century and a quarter and their causes. Economics courses may deal with problems of international commerce and finance and may indicate the dependence of the nations upon each other for the development of their industries and the exchange of their produce. International organization occasionally receives some treatment at the hands of the department of political science, and international law and diplomacy are a well established and pretty highly developed field of study. In some colleges specific phases of the wider problem, such as Latin-American relations or the Far East, are made the subjects of a course, but these, valuable as they are, cannot be considered a substitute for a general course in international relations. In their relation to the larger problem, and in the incompleteness of understanding of that problem which they furnish, they remind me of an International Relations Club I knew of last year which had chosen Mexico for its

year's discussion. By Christmas it had reached the Aztec civilization. Whether it ever got to Obregon and the relations of the United States to Mexico is a question.

Because of the inadequate treatment of international relations in the college curriculum, International Relations Clubs have been organized in some eighty-five or ninety colleges and universities, which meeting every two weeks or month as they do, help to call to the student's attention problems which the busy life on the college campus is likely to drive from his horizon. But this sort of approach to the problems of international relations cannot be other than spasmodic and incomplete, and it is a rare club which can keep a thread of common argument running thru the discussions of the year. Moreover, there are less than a hundred of these clubs as against the seven hundred odd colleges in the country. Finally they suffer the evils of all organization suggested in the story of the devil who, when asked by one of his imps, as they passed a man clutching a bit of Truth, whether he did not fear that man, answered, "No, indeed, I'll just teach him to organize."

Neither clubs nor existing classes, therefore, begin to handle adequately the teaching of international relations. To ensure a systematic and unified treatment of the subject a course should be offered which will correlate modern history, economics, geography, international law and diplomacy, anthropology and social psychology, and in the light of these subjects show up in their true significance the fundamental problems in the relations between nations. A whole-year course might begin with the history of international relations, running thru the rise of nationalism, political and cultural, and with a consideration of its psychological basis, the wars produced by a competitive nationalism, and the economic motive introduced as the world became more and more highly industrialized and a new kind of imperialism became part of the big industrial nations' foreign policies. A discussion of the economic imperialism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries might follow, and

in explanation a nice piece of work in economic geography might be done here.

It has been said that "the earth's geography, its inexorable climates with their flora and fauna, make a playground for the human will which should be well surveyed by any statesman who wishes to judge and act, not fantastically, but with reference to the real situation. Geography is a most enlightening science. In describing the habitat of man it largely explains his history." It might be added that it largely explains international relations as well. International relations are, to a great extent, a study in geography: human geography, describing the characteristics and manner of living of the races of the world; political geography, the territorial divisions of the world and the problems involved in maintaining these divisions; and economic and commercial geography, the economic resources of the nations, their industries, and the interdependence of the nations in respect to these industries. If the student were set to making maps and charts showing the principal industries of the world, the location of raw materials and foodstuffs in respect to national boundaries, transportation facilities and, as in the case of coal and iron, in respect to each other, and the important trade routes and markets of the world, the fact of the economic interdependence of the nations would be established without further comment, and the international strife resulting from the anomaly of politically independent nations in an economically interdependent world would be better understood.

The second semester of the course might be spent in studying international commerce and trade, and international finance, including in the former a consideration of preferential and discriminatory tariffs and their consequences, legitimate and illegitimate methods of promoting foreign trade, and so forth, and in the latter the alliance between export trade and foreign investment, the international complications arising from the protection of capital invested abroad, and the whole chain of problems connected with foreign investments, concessions and the "open door."



The student who had actually grasped the full significance of the facts so far might easily be plunged into a slough of despond by the evidence of anarchy and strife in the relations of nations in this twentieth century, and pessimism and despair might overwhelm him if it were not for the possibilities of solution that lie in the whole field of international co-operation. The course might close with a review of past experiments in international co-operation, judicial and administrative, and with a consideration of possible future developments, whether in the direction of a permanent international organization such as the League of Nations or an association of nations, or of disconnected international boards and commissions to regulate international trade and commerce, finance, the distribution of raw materials and foodstuffs, and the thousand and one other practical questions on which the nations are likely to split.

It is obvious that a course of this nature is not, and cannot be, the work of any one department, but is a pie in which the historian, the economist, the political scientist, the psychologist and the international lawyer must each have a finger. One of two methods might be followed in conducting such a course: either it might be an interdepartmental affair, the historian covering his part, the economist his, the psychologist his and the international lawyer his, or it might be put under any one of the departments mentioned but given according to a carefully prepared syllabus, which would prevent undue emphasis on any particular phase of the subject. The administrative difficulties associated with the former method are so great, and the value to the student of a course so conducted is so questionable, that the latter is probably the sounder way. If, in the case of a compulsory course in a university or large college, there would have to be several sections, the scheme adopted at Columbia in the course in Contemporary Civilization might be followed, and the sections turned over to the various departments concerned. The section conducted by a member of the department of history might emphasize the history of international relations and neglect the economic and legal aspects of the

subject, and so on, in the case of the economist, the political scientist and the lawyer. But this is inevitable. It is hoped that the syllabus would offset this difficulty so far as possible.

So much for a course in international relations. Herbert Spencer had a feeling that, if science could be introduced into the colleges, the students would develop scientific minds. Unfortunately the evidence does not support his belief. Nor is it more likely that if international relations could be introduced into the college curriculum, wars would cease. War as an institution has become firmly rooted in human society for two reasons: first, because it offers expression to impulses or instincts which in normal times are considered anti-social and must be repressed; and, secondly, because a complex system of international relations has developed without the simultaneous development of the machinery for adjusting those relations. Just as anarchy in the smaller units of society, whether the clan or tribe or nation, led to internal strife, so lack of organization, law and order, or what you will, in the relations of nations must result in war. The first of these tendencies to war, the instinctive, will not yield to a rational presentation of the facts, but the second, and I believe it is the more compelling and provides the situations which the instinctive responses take advantage of to promote and prolong the struggle, can be made to bow to reason. Bertrand Russell declares that "education should have two objects: first, to give definite knowledge, and secondly, to create those mental habits which will enable people to acquire knowledge and form sound judgments for themselves. The first of these we may call information, the second intelligence." Knowledge of the facts can develop that intelligence which will free men from the prejudices on which wars thrive. It can also reveal the problem of the adjustment of our international relations in all its complexity, and break down the easy optimism that pins its faith on a simple slogan or formula and cries out with an air of conviction "Peace" when there is none. The establishment of a smoothly functioning international system is an eminently practical problem, and one,

like the reorganization of our social system, involving attention to an infinite number of details. The men and women who leave our colleges must be prepared to do their part in working out these details. They must also have freed themselves from the shackles of prejudice and dogma which stand in the way of a healthy and far-seeing international consciousness. We have faith that the truth will set men free. I believe that the truth about international relations can eventually set men free from the scourge of war.

PRESIDENT R. F. SCHOLZ

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

My present predicament calls to mind the experience of the two middle aged English women who were visiting with Disraeli, the rival of Gladstone. Unable to settle an argument regarding the difference between misfortune and catastrophe, they referred the problem to Disraeli for settlement. He replied that he thought he could best settle the controversy by a concrete illustration. "If," said he, "Mr. Gladstone were to fall into the Thames, that would be a misfortune, but if somebody were to come along and rescue Mr. Gladstone out of the Thames, that would be a catastrophe." I regret that it should be your misfortune to have to listen to some inadequate ex tempore remarks after the incisive, logical and illuminating address of President Meiklejohn, and I regret even more that I should be faced with the catastrophe of attempting to telescope into the remarks of a few minutes our two years' experience at Reed College in our educational pioneering.

I wonder if it is an accident that recently there were published almost synchronously certain best sellers such as Bryce's *"Modern Democracies"*, Wells' *"Outline of History"*, Thompson's *"Outline of Science, Easy Lessons in Einstein"*—and *"Main Street."* Surely it is a sign and symptom of the increasing number and the widening interest of our adult reading public and, more important still, an indication that we are more and more consciously and

deliberately rousing ourselves out of our complacent provincialisms in an effort to really understand our world and to achieve a truly synthetic point of view.


There is another significant fact which we cannot afford to ignore—namely, the astounding increase during the past two decades in the number of our high school students and graduates. The problem of numbers will be an increasing issue in our programs for the educational reform of our colleges and universities. We should wake up to the fact that education today is not only a question of public service but that it is also a great co-operative national enterprise, and that the time has come for a new division of labor between our educational institutions. We must no longer think of our own particular institution as an independent or denominational college in isolation. The quantitative problem of democracy in education calls for reconsideration of the scope and function of our universities, colleges and professional schools; while the qualitative problem of education for an intelligent democracy raises the question of the type of education and the proper selection of the kind of student who can best profit by these various types of educational programs. I agree with President Meiklejohn that our fundamental concern is with the mind of the individual student and that the crux of our educational situation today is the four-year liberal college of arts and sciences. This will undoubtedly involve the question of limitation of numbers. It is an increasingly difficult problem to make sure of a wise investment in our human materials. Against the criticism that occasionally we shall lose budding genius by exclusion, it is only fair to point out the enormous wastage of the human wealth in our educational institutions and the high mortality rate of students due to the extension of standardized, impersonal mass education and to our failure to select the right kind of student for the particular type of educational institution.

I also agree with President Meiklejohn that a liberal college is not as much an institution as a community of like-minded human beings engaged in a common intellectual adventure. Scholarship, even culture, is after all not merely

a thing of individual minds, both involve membership in a community and are the outcome of co-operative thinking and co-operative living. They can be best attained under conditions of responsible freedom by a common intellectual experience based on recognition of the differences of personality, of the variations of humankind.

With these considerations in mind, we have been undertaking at Reed College an educational experiment based on an honest effort to disregard old historic rivalries and hostilities between the sciences and the arts, between professional and cultural subjects, and, may I add, between the formal chronological cleavage between graduate and undergraduate work. We are attempting to provide the opportunities and facilities for the individual student to achieve the fundamentals of effective, contemporary-minded living and of the humanized liberal profession, and, as a necessary outcome and by-product of our integrated, unified four years program, of those qualities and attitudes of mind which distinguish genuine culture.

I think you will agree with me that three of the most important problems facing us today are the reconciliation of democracy (and I may add Christianity) with our industrial order, of democracy and nationalism on the basis of self-respecting equality and moral autonomy with some form of world organization and world order; and last of all (particularly in view of the alarmist and pernicious influence of certain well-known, recent best sellers), the problem raised by the last great meeting of East and West with its portentous problem of the contact of races and cultures of various levels in an increasingly industrialized and democratic world. In all of these fields the drift towards the newer humanism is unmistakable. Economics is no longer merely a process of production but more and more a matter of human government involving the due recognition of the human equation and of the democratic truth that equality of opportunity is fundamental to true freedom. Fortunately or unfortunately, too, many of our great economic problems, national and international, have to be





settled politically. Similarly in the matter of international relations, one of our difficulties is the survival of the 18th century conception of the state and of the survival and intensification of century-old hatreds and prejudices. However, the state is being humanized, moralized, and the imperialism of exploitation and domination is gradually being transformed into temporary trusteeship against the time when the backward peoples of the earth shall have reached their political majority by the progressive extension of liberty and self-government. Most important of all, the problem of racial and cultural contacts and rivalries is ultimately and in the last analysis not so much a matter of biological difference or of the clash of economic interests as of a proper understanding of the habits of mind, mental attitudes and outlook that have been centuries in the making. Historic-mindedness, clear thinking and sympathy, are needed, along with a proper realization of the scientific facts underlying racial and cultural problems. Certain present-day movements and tendencies—not restricted by any means to Oregon—should impress upon us the duty of making plain to our citizens that Americanism is not to be achieved by force and compulsion in the realm of ideas and ideals and that we must not confuse external uniformity and conformity with what a Frenchman has so well called “a sacred union of hearts.” The great task and opportunity of the liberal college, it seems to me, is to make and keep our young men and women fit for freedom and for free institutions.

Now then, just what has been our program and policy at Reed? Forgetting historical antagonisms and more recent controversies and rivalries, we have attempted to make a fresh analysis of present-day conditions, tendencies and needs. On the basis of this analysis, the new Reed curriculum has been planned as a four year program, including vacations, and is intended for a residential, liberal, co-educational college, limited in attendance to five-hundred students in order not to jeopardize the quality of instruction. Our new program is, of course, tentative. Its pos-

sible success will depend on the morale and *esprit de corps* of the teaching force and on the attitude and co-operation of the students. Administrative considerations should be and are being subordinated to educational policy.

One of our first tasks is to eliminate the bookkeeping attitude towards education. We are trying to think no longer in terms of credits and units and three or four or five hour courses and are doing away with the water tight department system in favor of divisional groups in Literature and Language, History and Social Science, Mathematics and Natural Science, and Philosophy and Psychology. The student is encouraged to look upon his work as forming one unified course of study, and is made to feel that with his freshman year he enters upon a four year program all the various parts of which are closely bound up with one another. During the first two years he pursues an integrated course of study with differentiated but correlated reading and conferences, and with a further possible deviation accordingly as his primary interests lie in the field of Mathematics and Science or in that of Letters and Social Science. Instead of a freshman orientation and survey course, informational in nature, or a formal course a few hours a week devoted to teaching the student how to study and how to think, it is our plan to devote the work of the first two years to an examination of the fundamental basis and historical backgrounds of contemporary civilization, as they can be studied in the great representative fields of knowledge. The different ways of approach, methods of work, viewpoint or interpretation in identical or allied fields presented on a year's basis, the careful selection of a faculty composed of instructors who, while engaged in private research, are primarily teachers and who have had very different training and who hold differing opinions and viewpoints, and collateral and interrelated reading in the modern languages—all these tend to do away with the police attitude between students and faculty and to provoke thought and discussion after the fashion of Socrates' "Think Shop." Lectures are few; the conference method, by small groups

and individuals, predominates. Education is viewed as a co-operative process by discussion and consent. On that basis, an appeal is made not to make sure of minimum requirements but of maximum voluntary effort on the part of both students and faculty. The use of the textbook is reduced to a minimum, and we have had gratifying success with supervised suggested readings during the summer vacation. Enthusiastic co-operation of instructors is, of course, necessary, and frequent meetings are held of what are in the main separate "crews" of freshman and sophomore instructors. Under the new scheme, except in a limited number of cases, professors and assistant professors are given an opportunity to meet with small groups and with the individual students during the entire year, making unnecessary the usual artificial advisory systems by making it possible for the divisional faculty groups to be of great service in helping the individual student to a wise choice of a major interest when he comes to the end of the sophomore year. Incidentally, it helps to build up, also, a sound, self-respecting honor spirit and intellectual camaraderie.

We have worked out for the first two years a unified course of study which is elastic enough to permit the student to express and cultivate legitimate interests of his own, in the place of the old haphazard elective courses. The elective principle is preserved but is made to subserve the synthetic idea of an interrelated and integrated curriculum. The work of the freshman year is given up to a consideration of the evolution of man in nature and society, man's biological and social heritage, and his achievements in literature and the arts; and in lieu of the old formal logic course there is substituted an introduction to mathematical analysis and review of the basic conceptions and theories of exact science. In connection with this work in the History of Civilization, students are given the choice of reading in government and law, in economic and social institutions, or in cultural history, and in small supplementary conference sections this reading is correlated with an intensive study of some one phase of institutional development (political,

economic, social), or of culture (literature, art, music). The year's work in Biology, incidentally, provides an opportunity for a thorough preliminary study of the principles and processes of heredity and environment in their human applications, which serves to throw light on one of the very first problems met with in the History of Civilization, viz., the relation between race and language and culture. (I am simply trying to emphasize the point that these are not the ordinary survey courses.) This unified course of study during the freshman year is intended to provide the necessary perspective for a sound understanding of the modern world, to demonstrate the fundamental unity of mankind and of nature, and to make possible an understanding appreciation of the diversity of the contributions made by individuals and peoples to that totality which we call contemporary civilization. To an intensive study of this contemporary civilization, again in certain representative fields, the work of the sophomore year is devoted. As in the freshman year, the attempt is again made to correlate and integrate into a unified course of study for the year the literary, historical and social, and scientific approaches to the common field of study. For those whose primary interests lie in Mathematics and the Natural Sciences, the usual close correlations are preserved and emphasized.

While elastic enough to make possible the thorough undertaking of the necessary fundamental work in the natural sciences in proper sequence, the idea behind the unified work of the first two years is, as has been stated, to lay a foundation for the fundamentals of contemporary twentieth century living from the standpoint of citizenship and of a truly liberal professional career.

Though chronologically a part of the third year's work, the junior "half-course" in Citizenship and International Relations is really but the culmination and rounding out of the work of the first two years. It is an attempt to interpret to our students in their junior year when they are both mature enough and near enough the voting age to take an intelligent interest, the history and meaning of the United

States in its American, European, and world setting, as supplied by the study of the History of Civilization during the freshman and sophomore years.

At the end of the sophomore year, when the student is presumably sufficiently oriented to make a wise and happy choice for his real life interest, the divisional group of the faculty, who know him personally and whom he has had every opportunity of knowing himself, take counsel with each student individually and plan with him a unified course of study. The work of the last two years is intended to lay the broad foundation for a humanized liberal profession. We have no right to take that interest out of the life of the student. Scholarship and culture, the dignity of labor, and a life of service, should not be strangers, nor placed in any artificial or dangerous antithesis. It does not make much difference to us after this how many formal courses he attends. We are interested only in seeing that the student's time is wisely and fully occupied. So far as the junior and senior years are concerned, the college leaves to the discretion of the student and his instructors the allotment of time to the various studies and the type of instruction. The number of hours he spends in the classroom is not significant; neither is it required of instructors that they meet their classes for a certain fixed number of hours each week. In every possible way, the work is made elastic, and the student is thrown on his own resources under wise guidance, but on his own responsibility. The correlation which is so conspicuous a feature of the first two years is preserved and reinforced in the last two. By various methods, the student carries on parallel investigations in allied fields. At the end of the junior year an examination tests the knowledge of the student within his chosen field and allied fields and his fitness to enter upon the work of the senior year. This junior examination, as well as the examination at the end of the senior year, are not based on "courses" pursued by the student, but are intended to disclose the measure of proficiency and intellectual power attained by the student in the treatment of problems.



which fall within the field of study in which he has been engaged.

And as the outcome—or as the by-product, if you please,—of this four years of community experience, there are developed and cultivated those qualities and attitudes of mind which betray the presence of real culture and scholarship. First of all, clean, straight, independent thinking and thinking *through*, which recognizes the difference between authentic and authoritarian knowledge. Secondly, constructively critical, synthetic, historic-mindedness. This is perhaps one of our greatest needs, as witness our gropings and floundering in the present world situation and the costliness of our intellectual unpreparedness in undertaking an enlightened constructive foreign policy. Other illustrations from recent history abound. There was a nation that thought the shortest way to Paris was through Belgium, only to discover that it was the longest way in the end. There were imported into Russia recently a set of Western ideas that fitted neither the Russian background nor Russian peasant experience—at what a cost! Thirdly, scientific-mindedness and, above all, the scientific spirit—the passion for truth, the mental adventure of discovery, precision in the use of terms, the ability to distinguish between true and false in theories and hypotheses, the caution which guards against generalizations and hasty judgments.

Perhaps the most valuable experience in the four years—giving unity to the whole course of study and helping the student to clarify and formulate his own ideas concerning the nature of experience and knowledge, is the opportunity during the senior year to participate in a weekly two hour colloquium, in which small groups of students with major interests in the various fields are given an opportunity to thresh and test out the various interpretations of contemporary civilization and society with which they have come into contact during the college course and to think their way through to a philosophy of life—*their own*.

Enough has been said, perhaps, to give you some notion of the program for a four year unified course of study

which is now being tried out at Reed. This plan of meeting the diversified interests of students by individual work rather than by highly specialized courses naturally leads to a reduction of the number of courses offered. As the mechanism for improving the correlation and integration of the various subjects is perfected by increasing experience, it is hoped that duplication and overlapping of courses will be eliminated and that the number of lectures and class meetings will be still further reduced, with an increase in individual, voluntary student effort. A further economy of time and effort—to say nothing of an increased efficiency in teaching methods—is effected by an interesting experiment in our teaching of Literature, Modern Language, and Composition, which is giving every promise of success. After 1924, all students are expected to present a reading knowledge of French or German for entrance. Except in certain work restricted to juniors and seniors, all courses in Language are devoted exclusively to the purpose of enabling a student to read,—conversation and composition are eliminated. No specifically English, French, or German courses are offered; literary courses are division courses. The work in Latin, and in Greek beyond that of the first year, is purely literary. During the entire college course, students do collateral reading in the language which they present for admission in connection with all their courses. We have no composition course as such. Instruction in Latin and oral English in connection with all the work of the freshman and sophomore year, is given by conference, individual or in groups. The saving in time and effort thus effected is put to good use. Beginning with the freshman year and increasing in amount progressively with each succeeding year, each student is allowed a certain amount of time for independent reading on a year's basis, under the supervision of some one professor, for additional reading or laboratory work in connection with some one of the representative fields of knowledge of his own choice. We believe that the merely acquisitive process of information should be left increasingly to the individual student's own responsibility

and that the graduate attitude can be progressively developed during the four year college course by giving the individual students time and opportunity for developing themselves through independent reading and inquiry, through critical study, and, if at all promising, through creative work. From the beginning to the end of the college course the student is taught that his primary aim should be to acquire the power to think for himself, to seek out his own problems, his own sources of information, to make up his own bibliography, and to read widely.

I have more than imposed upon your patience. To conclude, my plea is simply the plea not merely to humanize knowledge but to humanize our institutions, and our teaching, so that we may help to make men and women not only of knowledge but of understanding and good-will.

PRESIDENT GEORGE B. CUTTEN

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

In discussing or trying to discuss the curriculum, especially from a functional standpoint, if I understand what that means, I am reminded of something that came out in the papers about six months ago on the Einstein theory; it was as follows:

"Twinkle, twinkle little star,  
How I wonder where you are,  
High up in the sky you shine,  
But according to Einstein  
You are not where you pretend,  
But you're just around the bend;  
And your sweet seductive ray  
Has been leading men astray  
All these years. Oh, little star  
Don't you know how bad you are!"

That is the way I feel when I start to discuss the curriculum. One thing has been agreed upon this morning, and this thing we all agree upon: It is somewhat of a maze,

especially when we take it from the standpoint of organization by function. The reason is because it is an experiment; when we talk about our curriculum we say, "Well, what have they done in England, France, or Germany?" We find there is nothing in the world which compares with our liberal arts college. We have divided the curriculum horizontally; criticisms have frequently been made, and brought out both by the last speaker and Dr. Meiklejohn that there is a difference between the Sophomore and Junior years; in other words, we are finishing our preparatory work in the first two years and then we start on university work in the second two years.

I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how it is possible for us ever to have any unity in our curriculum so long as we have a division of that kind. What the answer is going to be I don't know; whether we shall adopt a system which we see has been creeping in with the junior college so as to make a sharp division there, whether we shall adopt the system whereby we shall divide the curriculum at that point and finish the preparatory work and make a sharp dividing line before we take up university work; or whether we shall continue in what we call the college, a term we use differently from any other country, and try to unify what evidently never was intended to go together.

The second observation I wish to make, and I shall speak very briefly because there is very little time, if President Meiklejohn will permit me to infringe on his domain I'll say a word or two about logic. You needn't be afraid because I know the average college president is not very keen on the subject of logic except that he is more or less interested in an undistributed middle. What I want to bring before you is the old idea, from the standpoint of logic, as to what the college stands for and the new idea from the vocational standpoint. The old idea of a liberal arts college was that it provided the major premise, that we had to get all the knowledge we could possibly get into the curriculum. We had to cram the student full of general facts. We sent him out an encyclopedia if at all possible. Then there came

the vocational idea into our colleges which was the application of the minor premise. The general facts and the laws deduced therefrom were the major premises, the applications to definite objects upon which depended success in the world were the minor premises. We all knew the general laws and after some man had applied the minor premise in a particular way we said, "Anybody ought to know that. It's a wonder somebody didn't think of that before." The general law was there before. As soon as that was recognized we came to the conclusion all men would know the application, anybody would know that.

Now it seems to me the problem we are trying to solve at the present time, the problem that they are working out in Reed College, and we are trying to work out in all our colleges, is to try to provide the major premises and also to instill in the students the principles whereby they can apply the minor premises. We say, "No, we don't want you to apply it in college because that is vocational work, you mustn't do that, but we do want you in some way to get hold of the principles so that when you get out you will have the major premise, the general ideas, and you may be in a position to recognize the minor premise and to apply it." How this is to work out we don't know. We will all be very much interested, as we have been already in the presentation of the Reed program, to see how it works out. We recognize it as an experiment. We recognize the principles that are being used there, and we see the application of minor premises which we hope will give us the proper conclusion.

I hope the time has come when we as college presidents can break loose from our traditions. It is very difficult for us to do so, but if we can do so and if some of us can try some other experiment besides the one tried at Reed—we can take up some feature of the problem—we may organize our colleges in different ways, and so by coming together here and giving the experiences, such as we have had this morning concerning Reed College, we can get here a little from one college and there a little in another college until



we do master the problems that we have before us of instilling into our young people the principles which will lead them to apply, when the time comes, the minor premise to all the problems of life.

I know of nothing from the educational standpoint that is of more interest to us and still at the same time in which we seem to be more helpless than the problem that we have before us today in the functional reorganization of the curriculum, and when we have that solved, education will be a pleasure instead of, as sometimes I am afraid we find it to be in the colleges, a task.

---

### CLOSING DISCUSSION ON THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

DR. KELLY

The scope of the Commission's work is suddenly greatly enlarged! It has been considering methods of unifying the curriculum. It must concern itself now with the more difficult task of unifying the unifiers!

But after all, the differences, where such appear, are inherent in the method of procedure for this report. They are more apparent than real. If real, they are in minor points. Further exposition and discussion will reveal unity. All speakers subscribe to the functional point of view as desirable. Some seem to think it is not attainable. If really unattainable at present—it will be attained eventually—must the long-suffering student carry the entire load of condemnation? One sometimes hears a feeble pipe of protest from the students—"Worse than the dust though we be—is the fault ours alone?"

There is also considerable confusion on the part of all the speakers, including the present one, due to failure to hold to a consistent terminology. The term *curriculum* in technical usage means the studies pursued by the individual student. The faculty announces a *program of studies*. A good deal of this discussion has been on the corporate program of studies, not on the curriculum. Part of it has

been on corporate *objectives* and *ideals*, evidently carried over from last night. We have not held to the functional or any other kind of *method of procedure*.

A misunderstanding with reference to the significance of the *group* must especially be cleared up. No suggestion was made to substitute the group for the department. On the contrary, it was suggested that curriculum-mindedness must supplant department-mindedness. The fact that a college has a group system does not mean that students confine themselves to work within the several groups. When taken with some means of distribution, as was suggested, it is a guarantee that they do not do so. The provision always accompanies a liberally functioning group system that the student will take work in *each group*. The advantage of the group system over the system of stipulated course-requirements is that within each group there is some latitude of choice for each student. Each student will still get the historical method and the philosophic method and the scientific method, for he will approach his problem from the point of view of each group. As stated, a few colleges have this system in successful operation for each student enrolled. They have demonstrated its advantages in years of experience. It is not a *theory* but an approved method.

It is well to weigh the implications of some of the suggestions made in the discussion. It is proposed further to complicate the already badly scrambled curriculum by cutting the program of studies of the college into three distinct and separate parts. There must be a horizontal line separating the under-class men from the upper-class men, and then there must be a perpendicular line separating the upper-class men into a right wing and a left wing. There appears to be no center. Is the total result of this new surgery further to endanger the integrity of the four years' college course? Is it to offer aid and comfort to the junior college on the one side, and the graduate school on the other? Is it in the direction of the disintegration of the liberal college? It appears to be an avowal that only one-fourth of the liberal college can be liberal. The proposal is

made that the first two years of the college course be still conducted on an *academic* basis—that is, with detachment from student interest. The Freshman and Sophomore must pursue what the faculty prescribes and because they prescribe it. Thomas Elyot made the suggestion in 1530, "As far as poetry is concerned, Aristophanes, Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Silvius, Lucian, and Hesiod will suffice until the scholar pass the age of thirteen years."

The suggestion of the first speaker is that there may be a *method* of functional unity throughout the entire college course, that Freshmen may even hazily begin to understand what the enterprise means upon which they have embarked. The suggestion is made, of course, upon the assumption that modern education aims to produce an attitude of mind as well as to give instruction, that even the under-class men have some more or less latent love of mental adventure, that even they may respond to something of life as it is lived, that they may begin to develop standards of appreciation; in a word, that "the days are passed when education meant the mere acquisition of knowledge."

As a matter of fact, in most colleges now the Freshmen and their advisors make decisions as to the science and the language to be included in the individual curriculum, and these decisions are reached in the light of recognized aptitudes, preferences and previous studies. In most colleges the majors are selected in the Sophomore year.

It is a pretty conceit that students have no minds until they have been under the benign influence of the college about two years. The American public school is conducted on the supposition that students have minds. The corporate ideal of the public schools is *social efficiency*, to be attained by the development of *individual initiative, responsibility, and good-will*. The suggestion of the first paper was to carry this ideal over into the college. Let us not indiscriminately denounce the under-class men; let us examine our methods.

The psychological tests applied to Freshmen are conducted on the assumption that students have minds. Not only are measures made of keenness, suppleness, accuracy,

quickness and control by these tests, but special aptitudes are discovered as well, for music, art, mechanics, language and for much else.

The Columbia "Introduction to Reflective Thinking," which Committee G of the Association of University Professors has approved for Freshmen and Sophomores, is conducted on the assumption that students have minds and it proposes to try to develop among them the technique of thinking.

In a recent parade in a state university the arts school was represented by a hearse. For sometime educational coroners have been holding autopsies over the dead body of the liberal college. Perhaps some college students are in a state of suspended animation. The question may be pertinent, "Who killed Cock Robin?" Possibly he was killed by the arrow of some academic sparrow.

The institution in its corporate capacity may wish to express its ideal in terms of the community, or of American citizenship, or even of human brotherhood. All this is admirable but it may be expressed with such haziness and abstractness as to be of little immediate service to the student.

The significant question is not whether you have stated a beautiful aim but whether it is related to the reality with which the student is familiar, whether he is able to grasp its carefully worked-out meaning; whether he gets experience in applying it; whether the studies it provides enter the texture of his mind and come to form a part of his being.

If this happens, his problem becomes social, for one of the presuppositions of American education is that each child is a social person. The suggestion of community thinking is, of course, a necessary implication, as has been pointed out. There has been community thinking in the college from time immemorial. Only we have called it academic thinking. It has quite frequently been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Over and over again it has been demonstrated that if the community or the state stands at all, it stands on the legs of individual persons. The super-

state has never stood at all, for there are not yet enough human legs strong enough to hold it up.\* The academic mind in many of its manifestations has been abstracted from the interests of individuals and groups. Even the crude aim of a Sophomore sometimes brings it down to the earth.

A curious illustration of community thinking is reported from last year's Senior class in one of our theological seminaries. The men were so enamored of this process of community thinking and working that upon graduation they volunteered for service in the foreign mission field on condition that the entire group might be assigned to one station. The true missionary motive is service. A new community must be achieved not an old one transplanted or perpetuated. The community as well as the individual is in danger of falling into the fatal trap, when the organ is made inviolable and the function is lost, when quantity and subject-matter are put before quality and interest.

There is plenty of evidence that there are groups of students in most colleges who have worthy interests which may be made the basis of functional unity. Some of these groups are profoundly interested in problems of international relations, as Miss Alexander has pointed out. Others are seriously concerned with the vital problems of industry, and still others with aims that may be stated in terms of scholarly research, as for example, the group of Barnard students and later of Mt. Holyoke students who with great care have produced a college curriculum!

The recently organized National Student Forum is a symptom of the existence among groups of college students of a desire to think and to relate their thinking to what they conceive to be reality. The implication here is that in default of official action thinking must be another "student activity!"

Perhaps I may be allowed to give a few illustrations from the field of religion. It must not be forgotten that 75 per cent of our college students come from the homes of church

---

\*William James once said of a certain faculty: "There is nothing more wonderful than our collective wisdoms, unless it be our individual and concrete ignorances."



members. Before they enter college they have been subjected to the multiplying agencies of religious training. Many of them come to college with profound religious convictions. Eighty per cent of the men who enter the ministry make their decision to do so not in college but before they enter college. They bring with them to the college aspirations and yearnings, embryonic and mute life problems. Shall the college asphyxiate these students? There are religious teachers in colleges in every section of this country who when they enter a fraternity house at night will be backed up against the wall and pinned there until the wee small hours answering or attempting to answer the serious questions of these college men upon what they consider problems of reality. In one of the great state universities of the Mississippi Valley the enrollment in the curriculum classes of the School of Religion is one-tenth of the total enrollment of the university and is increasing more rapidly than the total enrollment of the university.

A few years ago the students in one of our universities founded during Colonial days offered a petition that the implications and meaning of Christianity be unfolded to them during their college course. The petition was approved by unanimous vote by the Committee on Curriculum of the Board of Trustees. The head of the Department of Philosophy consented to try his hand in working up a course on the Philosophy of Christianity. He became so intensely interested that he spent a year and a half in the preparation of the course. When finally announced, it was open as a free elective to Seniors only and was scheduled for 7:55 A.M. during the second half year. Fully one-third of the Senior class of more than 400 students, including all of the Hebrews in the class, registered for the course, and the pressure of interest soon became so great that it was necessary to apply the tutorial system to small groups to meet the demands for discussion. It is sometimes feared that in matters of religion the academic mind has stopped working.

So long as colleges are satisfied to arrange, to tabulate, to chronicle, and even to discover curriculum material with

reference alone to their own corporate ends and ignoring the developing problems of the students themselves, the hearse may continue to be a fit symbol of the liberal college, but when professors are developed who are profoundly concerned in the progress of the student, first, as an individual, and then in his relation to the community and the world, meaning will be put into the curriculum to which the student will joyfully respond.

This is not a plea for early specialization. It is not a plea for vocational training. It does not look toward concentration at the expense of distribution. It is a suggestion that the college deals with persons and that the motive for education must be in the individual. It is a plea for quality; for a hand-made product. It is not enough to say that the liberal college has *not* become vocationalized. It must be said positively that the liberal college *has become motivated*, along with the rest of education and of life. It is a plea for reality. It may be revolutionary for it suggests that the principle of self-determination under the guidance of men who strive to see the problem of the liberal college steadily and see it whole be applied to what has been heretofore called academic. It is not that students cease their effort to attain the scientific and literary and historical and philosophical method, but that they do all this *as a means to the satisfaction of developing intellectual, ethical and social interests*.

Of course, if an individual student does not respond to this functional ideal, if he proves to be hopelessly narrow in his vision and shortsighted in his interests, he can be turned over to the Committee on the Limitation of Enrollment. There are probably professional or vocational schools in which he will feel more at home. But first of all, every student who is competent to pass the modern and multiplying tests of admission should be given an opportunity to achieve a liberal education, which is no less liberal or cultural because it is related to the well-springs of his being.

**REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON  
ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

DEAN CHARLES N. COLE

At the meeting of this Association last year a preliminary report was presented by the Commission on Academic Freedom, recommending the adoption of certain general principles as a statement of the views of the Association upon this important subject. At the suggestion of the Commission itself, the report was printed in the Proceedings of the meeting, and laid over for a year, in order to give the colleges ample opportunity for consideration of its contents. The question of adoption, revision, or rejection of the report now recurs.

The Commission still holds that some such formulation as is embodied in this report is desirable, if not absolutely necessary. Few cases of difficulty over freedom of speech or security of tenure arise in the colleges of the Association, but when they do arise it usually becomes evident that there is vagueness on both sides in regard to some of the most fundamental principles involved in the discussion. A formulation of the beliefs of such an organization as this would be useful in two ways: it would provide a bill of rights for teachers employed in the colleges of the Association, and it would lay the foundation for a code of ethics, which would indicate in some measure the obligations resting upon teachers even in the exercise of their admitted rights. It could not anticipate all the special questions that will come up in practice, of course; but the reduction of the most general questions and those most frequently arising to principles of broad application could hardly fail to be of value in clarifying the situation.

The report as presented is an effort to recognize the just claims of both sides of a very difficult problem. On one side are the desires of the college teachers, a great body of men

and women who have devoted their lives to a highly specialized calling, and who are entitled, by virtue of their training, the dignity of their vocation, the value of their services both to the college and to the public at large, and indeed by the very demands of their work, to the largest possible measure of freedom of thought and utterance, and to the greatest allowable security of tenure. On the other side are numerous colleges, such as make up the larger part of this Association, equally devoted to the impartial investigation and unbiased teaching of truth, and in addition bound by the force of an acknowledged and valued heritage of Christian tradition to maintain an environment conducive to the development of spiritual personality in the youth entrusted to their care. At certain points of contact these rights and purposes come into sharp conflict, one that in an extreme form would become a death grapple between academic freedom and religious liberty. For if absolutely unrestricted freedom of thought and utterance should immediately be guaranteed to all teachers in all fields of study, some institutions of this Association, perhaps in course of time a considerable number, would almost certainly be forced out of existence; and if every institution should without hindrance restrict thought and utterance to strict accordance with the beliefs of its constituency and its own ideals and purposes, the range of a teacher's freedom would at certain points be restricted to woefully narrow bounds.

It will perhaps be as well to examine somewhat more fully the attitudes that come into conflict. That of the college teacher has been set forth most fully by the Committee on Academic Freedom of the American Association of University Professors, in the memorable report of 1916 and in later supplementary reports. The thesis of the main report is, in brief, that all universities and colleges not strictly bound by their founders to a propagandist duty are a public trust; that their teachers are responsible primarily to the public, and to the judgment of their pro-

fession; that in regard to thought and utterance, their relation to the trustees of their institution should be considered analogous to that of federal judges to the President of the United States, who appoints them, but has no control over their decisions; and that "any university which lays restrictions upon the intellectual freedom of its professors proclaims itself proprietary, . . . and has no claim whatever to general support or regard."

This point of view, held by the Association of University Professors, to be applicable to all institutions except a very few that were founded and are maintained for definite religious, economic, or social propaganda, seems to be fairly open to the criticism that while it stresses, as indeed it should, the rights of teachers, the obligations of institutions to teachers, and the interest of the general public in the preservation of individual liberty, it entirely overlooks the rights of institutions, the obligations of teachers to the institutions, and the interest of the general public in the right of institutions to existence and collective freedom of thought and speech. An Association of Colleges cannot disregard these sides of the question.

Over five hundred colleges and universities, according to Doctor Kelly, owe their origin to the religio-educational impulse, and now recognize some kind of affiliation with the churches. In some of these the connection has of course become simply historical, and the colleges are actually public institutions. In others, and this probably applies to the great majority of the members of this Association, the affiliation still has a vital significance. Such colleges were founded, as a rule, by persons who desired to establish an institution in which investigation and teaching, especially the latter, should always be surrounded by an atmosphere of moral and religious earnestness. Since their founding they have been supported, and for the future must expect to be supported, not by a general public interested only in the discovery



and teaching of truth for truth's sake, but by donors concerned for, or at least willing to contribute for, the maintenance of the inherited and avowed ideals and purposes of the school. And they are patronized in the future, by parents who want their children educated in the atmosphere existing, or believed to exist, in the college of their choice. The loyalty of its clientele, in a word, and its whole chance of life, hang upon its maintenance of its own peculiar religious and social atmosphere.

Now it can hardly be claimed that the requirements of the situation are adequately met by declaring institutions of this sort proprietary whenever they find it necessary to impose any limitation upon the freedom of speech of their teachers. In forbidding the teaching of doctrines they regard as wrong or unproved, and in any case destructive of ends they are bound to maintain, they are restricting intellectual freedom in a way entirely analogous to that in which the national government, with the approval of the University Professors, placed limitations upon the freedom of speech of all its citizens, professors included, in the crisis of the great war. That some of the colleges are utterly wrong in their views, in the practically universal judgment of the intellectual world, must be admitted. It should not be forgotten, however, that differences in the freedom allowed and allowable by individual colleges are mainly differences in degree, so that in an extreme case even the most independent institution would come in some measure within the prescribed class. What college or university would, under the banner of academic freedom, permit its professors to teach atheism, or advocate the substitution of polygamy or free love for the family, or urge the destruction of all government?

What, again, is the real situation of the teacher who accepts appointment in one of these religio-educational colleges which still is under the original impulse? As a private person he has, of course, the right to practically entire free-

dom, in the formation, expression, and advocacy of his opinions on all subjects, scientific, philosophical, religious, social, political or any other, within or without his special field of study. Restrictions imposed by the state or the nation are the only ones that apply to him as a person. As scholar and teacher, also, he must have entire freedom from intellectual restraint if he is to realize his highest measure of growth, complete self-respect, and the unqualified regard of other scholars and of his students. But in accepting the appointment to his position he came into the service of an institution with whose avowed purposes he was presumably familiar, whose object in calling him, he must admit, was to enlist his cooperation in carrying out those purposes, and whose right it clearly is, in consequence, to require of him that, at the very least, he do not work in opposition to those purposes.

Even the matter of the public interest has another side, which should not be passed over without attention. The primary importance, for the public at large, of intellectual liberty among college teachers has often been emphasized, and cannot be gainsaid. But of even longer standing is national recognition of the vital importance of religious liberty, the right of every person, every institution, to hold and teach its own beliefs, however perverse and groundless they seem to others. Here again is a conflicting right that may not be lightly set aside.

Where, then, in case of conflict, is the greater right? After all, there can be no doubt that that of individual freedom is the larger, the growing one, the one destined ultimately to prevail. The whole history of intellectual achievement is a record of the growth of individual freedom of thought and utterance. The present attitude of the stronger, more independent colleges toward that freedom, itself in most cases a slow development through the years, is prophetic of the universal attitude of the future. To that position the Association of American Colleges, the

teachers in the colleges, and the general public are sure to come eventually. For it, in consequence, as the end to be attained, the declaration of the Association should now be made, and toward it the Association should strive to lead, with such speed as it may, colleges and constituencies not now ready for it. Meantime, there is obvious need of mutual adjustment and of a spirit of co-operation on both sides. Teachers caught in a conflict of aims should cheerfully help in meeting obligations imposed by the spirit and purposes of the college, and the college, if faced with the necessity of imposing any limitation upon freedom of utterance, should keep the restrictions within the narrowest possible bounds, and enforce them in a mood of generous anticipation of a time when the needs of restriction may be wholly done away.

It was in the light of such consideration that a statement of the ideal of academic freedom was formulated by the Commission a year ago, together with a set of temporary conventions to which, it was hoped, all colleges unable at once to assent to the ideal, could meantime give their adherence. The statement of the ideal reads (Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting, 1922, p. 98) :

"The ideal college atmosphere is one in which, on the one hand, the institution guarantees to all its teachers unrestricted freedom in teaching, investigation, and publication, and in which, on the other hand, competent, judicious scholars exercise their freedom with fitting regard for the welfare and reputation of the institution they serve."

It is recognized that universal realization of this ideal in the colleges of this Association is quite impossible at the present time, and will be very difficult at any time. The key to its early realization is really more in the hands of the teachers than of the colleges. Given a teaching body of competent, conscientious scholarship, of judicial temperament, and of sympathetic attitude toward the aims and

ideals of the college—to such a body almost any institution could, and in the not too remote future almost all probably would, grant unquestioned freedom of utterance. Until such bodies become the rule, however, or until a radical change is wrought, by a necessarily slower process, in the situation of many colleges, such an Association as this could hardly go to the length of endorsing absolutely unrestricted freedom of expression. The needs of the case at present would seem to require instead the adoption of a working arrangement, of the general nature of the “conventions” proposed a year ago.

In making its recommendations for the conventions the Commission recognized four problems, dealing respectively with research, with teaching and publication, with discussion of outside matters in the classroom, and with public discussion of matters outside the teacher's special field of study. In regard to research, the Commission holds that institutions can claim no right to restrict, so far as subject or results are concerned, either within or without the teacher's special field. In regard to teaching in one's special field, whether in the classroom or in addresses and publications outside, a right to restriction in case of necessity is conceded. With reference to classroom discussion of subjects outside the teacher's special field, especially of controversial topics, the Commission holds that the teacher can claim, and the college can defend, no right to any such privilege. While no harm may arise from the practice, the wisdom of taking time from the stated work of the class is questionable, in any case, and where friction is caused, real damage is pretty sure to result. With reference to participation in the discussion of public affairs outside the college, on the other hand, it is held that it would be most injurious to attempt to take from the college teacher any of his rights as a man and a citizen. That it is difficult to secure dissociation of the teacher from his college is true. But if the teacher is careful to make it clear that responsibility for his utterances on controversial topics rests only

upon himself, he should not be restrained from the advocacy even of doctrines opposed to the general position of the college, provided they do not become subversive of its ideals and purposes to such a degree as to do it serious harm with its constituency. Then, upon the same grounds as in classroom teaching, a right to restriction is conceded as necessary under present conditions.

The formal statement of the four temporary conventions is, therefore, as follows (Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting, 1922, p. 99) :

(a) The college may not place any restraint upon the teacher's freedom in investigation, unless restriction upon the amount of time devoted to it becomes necessary in order to prevent undue interference with the teaching which is the primary function of the college instructor.

(b) The college may not impose any limitation upon the teacher's freedom in the exposition of his own subject in the classroom or in addresses and publications outside the college, except insofar as the general necessity of adapting all instruction to the needs of immature students, or specific stipulations in advance, fully understood and accepted by both parties, limit the scope and character of instruction.

(c) No teacher may claim as his right the privilege of discussing in his classroom controversial topics outside of his own field of study. The privilege is often exercised, but the support of the college may not be expected in cases where friction arises from the practice.

(d) The college must recognize the teacher's right, in speaking or writing outside of the college upon subjects beyond the scope of his own field of study, to precisely the same freedom and the same responsibility as attach to all other persons, subject only to the necessity of protecting the good name and the



welfare of the college against serious injury. The teacher in all speaking and writing of this character should be scrupulous in making it clear that his institution has no responsibility for the views expressed by him.

Upon the basis of some such statement of ideal ends and some such practical conventions as concessions to current need, some progress might be made toward unity in the general view of the problem and toward consistency in dealing with it. More than a beginning can hardly be hoped for, as matters stand, but a beginning ought to be made. Adoption of the present report, if it should be adopted, ought to mean something more than an easy shelving of a troublesome question. Freedom of teaching is a problem that will not cease from troubling until an adequate solution is found. This Association could hardly attempt a more useful undertaking than to determine soon the lines upon which the solution is to be sought, and then to exert, patiently and persistently, its efforts and its influence along those lines.

#### ACADEMIC TENURE

The problem of academic tenure is much broader than that of academic freedom, for only about one-third of all the controversy in colleges and universities over tenure arises from disputes over freedom of teaching, and the principles underlying the questions involved are quite as clouded. The question is important, too, for in a time when there are increasing signs, among the abler college men, of a drift away from the graduate school and the teaching profession, it is imperative that all factors that contribute unnecessarily to a lowered estimate of the profession be removed. One of the weightiest of such factors is insecurity of tenure, and one of the greatest boons to the profession would be the universal adoption of a policy of real security at that point.

The establishment of security of tenure, however, does

not mean the bestowal of life tenure upon all college teachers not disqualified by gross misconduct. The term means rather the adoption of a policy by which teachers of tested competence, character, and loyalty are lifted above the plane of annual, biennial, or quinquennial re-appointments, with their uncertainties and occasional disagreeable surprises, and put into the position of trusted partners, as appointees without term. Here they are free from the petty annoyance of stated appraisal at frequent intervals, but they are none the less subject to all the college requirements of growth, diligence, co-operation, success in teaching, and general fitness for their places. "Subject to removal for cause" is a term elastic enough to include failure at any of the points indicated, and to protect the college from the degenerate in industry, character, scholarship, or teaching power. The difference in position from that of the untested on brief appointment is that while the probationer may, if found wanting at any point, be quietly dismissed at the end of any term, the teacher once tested and approved may be dismissed only upon grounds that will stand the scrutiny of his fellows, as well as of the administrative and governing bodies. As much as this is due to the tried and proven teacher, and will react to the benefit of the college that gives it.

The recommendation that teachers of higher rank and indefinite tenure, composing a senate or council, have part in determining the appointment, reappointment, and dismissal of teachers, is not a necessary part of a policy of tenure. It has an indirect bearing upon the matter of security, however, because it contributes to the confidence of the teacher to know that the appraisal of his worth and the determination of his fortunes rests at least in part in the hands of a large group of his peers. It is a plan expensive of time, but it has proved in long-continued use to pay large returns in an augmented sense of responsibility in the teachers entrusted with these

powers, and in their greatly broadened and deepened knowledge of college problems.

The recommendations submitted last year in regard to academic tenure read as follows (Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting, 1922, p. 102):

(a) First appointments should as a rule be temporary and be followed by renewals or short-term appointments until the competence of the appointee and the mutual compatibility of the college and the appointee are fully established. Thereafter a greater security of tenure, especially in the higher ranks, should be indicated by characterization of the appointment as permanent, indefinite, without term, or for some extended term with presumption of renewal at its expiration. All appointments should be made in conference with the department concerned, and might well be subject to approval by a faculty or council committee, or even by the faculty or council itself. The precise terms and expectations of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both college and teacher.

(b) Termination of a temporary or a short-term appointment should always be possible at the expiration of the term by the mere act of giving timely notice of the desire to terminate. The decision to terminate should always be taken, however, in conference with the department concerned, and might well be subject to approval by a faculty or council committee or by the faculty or council. Notice of the decision to terminate should be given in ample time to allow the teacher an opportunity to secure a new position. The extreme limit for such notice should not be less than three months before the expiration of the academic year. The teacher who proposes to withdraw either before or at the end of a term should give equal notice.

(c) Termination of a permanent or long-term appointment for cause should regularly require action by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the college. Exception to this rule

may be necessary in cases of gross immorality or of disloyalty to the country, when the facts are admitted. In such cases summary dismissal would naturally ensue. In cases where other offenses are charged, and in all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should always have the opportunity to face his accusers, and to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. In the trial of charges of professional incompetence, the testimony of scholars in the same field, either from his own or from other institutions, should always be taken. Dismissal for other reasons than immorality, treason, or gross neglect of duty should not ordinarily take effect in less than a year from the time that the decision is reached.

(d) Termination of permanent or long-term appointments because of financial exigencies should be sought only as a last resort, after every effort has been made to meet the need in other ways and to find for the teacher other employment in the institution. Situations which make drastic retrenchment of this sort necessary should preclude expansions of the staff at other points at the same time, except in extraordinary circumstances.

#### THE INQUIRY AMONG THE COLLEGES

The returns from the questionnaire sent out in December to the colleges of the Association seem to fortify the position of the Commission at almost every point. Only one hundred of the two hundred and fifty colleges sent in replies, but the list makes such an admirable cross-section of the membership of the Association, representing as it apparently does every kind of institution and every shade of belief on the questions involved, that it may reasonably be held to represent the probable feeling of the whole Association. Care in the preparation of the replies seemed evident everywhere, and a considerable number of extended comments accompanied the questionnaire itself. Of the interest and courtesy

thus manifested the Commission desires to record its grateful acknowledgment.

A summary of the returns may be made briefly. For freedom of research 87 declared, and only 4 positively against it. On unrestricted freedom of teaching one's own subject there was much sharper division, 37 for, 48 against, the rest undecided or not answering. The negative vote is strengthened, however, by the fact that 61 maintained the validity of a claim for restriction on the ground of the immaturity of the students, and 65 on account of economic, religious, scientific, or social beliefs; against such restriction 25 voted in the one case, 23 in the other. In similar fashion 47 voted for the necessity of restriction upon lecturing and writing in one's own field, 38 against; but 68 felt that restraint might need to be applied to avoid injury to college interests, and only 13 declared against that view. For stipulation in advance there were 60 votes, against it 22, some of whom felt that it would be of no practical value. On the question of the teacher's right to discuss outside matters of a controversial nature in his classroom, 53 declared against such a right, 30 for it; 46 opposed permitting it at all, 16 were willing to permit it, though denying the existence of a right to it. A large majority hold for the teacher's right to as much freedom as any other person to share in the public discussion of matters outside his own field, 63 to 23, but an almost equal majority, 58 to 20, concede the right of the college to restrict in order to avoid serious offense to its constituency, and a larger one, 70 to 12, believe in the right of the college to require that teachers make it clear in such circumstances that the college is not responsible for their views.

In the section on academic tenure a great majority, 75 to 12, believe in always consulting the department concerned in regard to appointments, reappointments or dismissal, but a narrower margin, 42 to 40, and 10 not clear on the subject, accept the principle of faculty par-



ticipation, by some representative body, in such actions. For adequate notice to a teacher to be dismissed or not reappointed, the vote was overwhelming, 86 in one case and 82 in the other, only two of those who answered the question declaring outright against it. For a tenure of some degree of permanency after a satisfactory probation 76 declared, against it only 13. That a teacher to be dismissed after attaining such tenure is entitled to a copy of the charges against him, if he wishes it, is the prevailing view, 75 to 11, but that he should have, on demand, a trial or hearing by a representative body of the faculty is held by but 47, against 36 opposing.

As to the desirability of establishing an agency of this Association to investigate cases of dismissal of teachers the vote is a decided negative, 56 to 26, but on the question of formulating a list of causes that would, in the judgment of the Association, warrant the dismissal of a teacher, the margin is narrower, 41 for, 43 against.

#### Supplementary Recommendations

The Commission now recommends:

1. That the report submitted last year and laid over for action at this time be adopted.
2. That the Association do not undertake to establish an agency for the investigation of dismissals of college teachers.
3. That the Association do not undertake to formulate the causes that would in its judgment justify dismissal of a college teacher.

\*   \*   \*   \*

Motion for adoption of the report of the commission was offered, seconded, and carried.

## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF COLLEGES

### *The Field and Constituency of Colleges in Colorado*

PRESIDENT MELVIN A. BRANNON

It should be stated that this discussion is not based on my own personal studies. It is a review of some of the data contained in the *Bulletin*, Volume VIII, No. 5, of the Association of American Colleges. This *Bulletin* contains the results of general studies made in higher education in Colorado. Specific reference in the findings is made to Colorado College.

The distribution of colleges depends upon four main factors, population, the economic resources of the area surveyed, transportation facilities, and the educational service which the institution seeks to render. There are many minor factors, but these are the essential agencies considered in the Colorado situation.

Colorado has a population of 950,000, divided between urban and rural districts in a fifty-fifty ratio. Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Boulder, Greeley, and Trinidad are the most populous urban centers of the state and they contain practically 39 per cent of the total state population. These six urban centers produce over one-half of the manufactured products of the state, approximately 54 per cent.

On account of the importance of the population factor, it has been suggested as a primary measure in determining the number of colleges which may be established with satisfactory results within the geographical center studied. In harmony with this idea, The Colorado *Bulletin* suggests 100,000 population within a fifty mile radius of the institution as a safe and satisfactory background for determining the distribution of colleges. It is recognized that not all of the population within the fifty mile radius will be entirely available for the college within the area studied. To illustrate, Pueblo is located within

a fifty mile radius of Colorado College. It sends three times as many students to the State University, and twice as many to the other state institutions, as it sends to Colorado College.

The influence of the church as a factor does not seem to be particularly marked in Colorado. Colorado College has in attendance twice as many Methodists and Presbyterians as it has Congregationalists, although primarily Colorado College was a Congregational institution.

The latest occupational distribution reports indicate that there is a shifting in the proportion of people engaged in manufacturing, transportation, and mineral industry. On the other hand there is a slight advance in the number of those preparing for clerical, trade, and agricultural pursuits. This indicates that the influence of occupational distribution is in the direction of emphasizing higher education.

Population, then, as an element in the field and constituency of a college, must be considered from the standpoint of social needs, general intelligence of the people, educational attainments in secondary education, and the general attitudes and needs of the people relative to collegiate education.

In these days of increasing costs, it is manifest that material resources constitute an important and controlling factor in the distribution and support of colleges. It is true that in privately endowed colleges much of the endowment has come from outside sources, notably the East. The resources for the support of state colleges must be derived from revenue producing sources of the state itself. The ability to pay for educational guidance within the State of Colorado has been augmented by the large returns from the mineral and more recently from the highly developed agricultural activities of the State. "The value of irrigated farms is said to be six times as great as the value of the gold, and the value of all farms four times as great as the value of the mines and quarries."

In 1918 Colorado was ranked fifteenth in the list of forty-eight states relative to state expenditures for higher education, excluding normal schools. In the school year 1919-20 Colorado gave \$1,446,503 for the support of the University of Colorado and the Agricultural College. This emphasizes the fact that commonwealths are giving most generous support to the cause of higher education. The ability to tax all the citizens of the state for state-supported colleges has direct bearing upon the number of denominational colleges which are already established or whose establishment is had in contemplation.

While the accent is placed upon economic resources as determining elements in the distribution of colleges in Colorado and elsewhere, one cannot overlook the importance of the social, industrial, vocational, religious, and political resources and their influence upon distributing and maintaining colleges, both privately and state supported.

Transportation is properly ranked as an important agent in determining the number of colleges which should be had within any geographical area. Transportation can no longer be discussed in the single item of steam-drawn cars. While the railways are the major socializing agencies in Colorado, the automobile must be had in mind, particularly with the extension of good highways, when considering the radius within which the college draws its constituency. It is probable that the automobile has doubled the distance within which the college draws the major number of its student body today. This is especially true in the regions of the modern highways. This advance in transportation facilities therefore, becomes a very positive delimiting factor in the distribution of colleges. Extend your highway system and increase the number of automobiles and you have made the college easily accessible to a constituency several times as large as that the institution had prior to the automobile age.

A factor which should be carefully studied in the distribution of colleges is the educational service which the present state of society requires of the modern college. This factor may be cared for by the changing order within the colleges already established. If they meet the demands with reasonable facility in their adaptation, the needs for cultural and disciplinary training, which are the two definite contributions of the modern colleges, will be cared for without duplicating college plants. This interesting point is elaborated in the *Bulletin* on Pages 293-297. The following excerpt is very much to the point:

"There is a tendency in the privately supported college to try to compete with the state in the field of technical studies. This results in spreading out to a fatuous thinness. The study believes that the current emphasis on technical departments in such institutions may more properly give way to an increased development of the study of the human relations of all occupation, not agriculture, but rural life; not engineering, but industry; not forestry, but the logger in his lumber camp. Only in this way can the Christian college adequately fulfill her own acknowledged field and only so can she save herself from duplicating the work of the state. There is feasible in many liberal arts colleges, a greatly renewed emphasis on history, economics, sociology, religious education, geography, missions, and the human side of industrial problems and of environmental service and adaptation.

"There is continuous discussion in the educational world as to how to get American collegians on to the intellectual level of foreign university students. In Colorado institutions as in all others in this country the college work depends greatly upon texts, lectures, memory and deductions. It contains quantities of work in general history, in principles of given subjects, in surveys of small special fields, and elementary



drill and technique especially in the modern languages. There is as a whole not enough work requiring comparison, analysis, judgment, inductive thinking. This segmentation of knowledge accumulated in definite strata is thwarting to the inner development of the student. No outside agency can prove that this exists in one place more than in another, that it exists at all or that it could be improved by any sort of internal adjustments. All impetus for vital change in institutions comes from within.

"All qualitative college work ought to consider continuously the general tendency of education to become stereotyped and to seek for its liberation.

"The past isolation of the denominational policies in founding colleges can not be retrieved, but ought not to be perpetuated. The denominations now investing money and sacrifice in higher education ought to have some guarantee that there will be no sporadic attempts to found new colleges until there is a need for them as colleges for an increasing population. The existing colleges in turn ought continuously to demonstrate by recognized tests, that their leadership is effective. Denominations wishing to provide increased educational opportunity for Colorado, for hypothesis, the Presbyterian Church or the Disciples of Christ, ought to carry out their purposes through affiliation with the University of Denver and Colorado College. It is even now possible that the Baptist Church might find a better way of carrying out its plans than through its present vehicle, the Colorado Woman's College.

"There have been many cases of institutions entering certain fields with the intention of becoming pre-eminent in those fields. It yet remains, however, for any state to become pre-eminent in educational comity as between all its institutions. Any unified program should result in formal agreement between state institution and state institution, between denomina-

tional institution and denominational institution and in informal agreement between state and denominational institutions. It should especially provide for the reduction of undergraduate mortality, and for the farther development of specialization in fields designed for each institution."

"All recent studies of higher education have shown the dependence of that field on physical bases of civilization. There must be towns and cities, transportation, agriculture, manufactures, population, or there cannot be colleges. A map of the density of population for the state of Colorado shows that the area containing high schools belonging to the North Central Association, within which zone all the colleges of the state are, coincides roughly with the maximum density of population. In the counties having six to eighteen and eighteen to forty-five in population density, the higher average is usually caused by a city, which is within the high school zone.

"The zones of education will widen only as the zones of city influence widen.

"The present student body of a little more than 6000 is cared for by eight degree-conferring institutions, five of which are in a group enrolling 600 to 1200 undergraduates. Upon the present distribution of cities, the number of students can probably be doubled before there is need of another institution. It could be tripled and still not go without bounds reached by universities and colleges in this country.

"Colorado has at present three chief zones of higher education, one the Denver and state institution neighborhood, one the Colorado Springs neighborhood, one the Gunnison to Grand Junction neighborhood."

The particular application of the discussion of higher education in Colorado as it applies to Colorado College is included in the following quotations, pages 302-303:

"Colorado College is in an area providing all the

advantages of *population, transportation, high school facilities and material resources*. State institutions and the University of Denver cross the same area, so that the sum total of advantages must be divided by two or even three. This cuts the influence of Colorado College down to a more localized area. The questions for which Colorado College is seeking a solution are the questions asked by all education under private auspices.

- (1) The size of the institution for a given period and the amount of endowment per student.
- (2) The educational policy involved in choosing between an exclusively liberal arts college, or one which offers some technical work.
- (3) The means feasible to achieve a higher intellectual level of student attainment.
- (4) The attitude among denominations toward the respective merits of founding new colleges as isolated projects or carrying on Christian education through the denominational and independent colleges already established, and through affiliation with state institutions.

"The study returns to the fact that Colorado is divided into three zones of development coiled one within the other. These zones of the state support the colleges by sending students in proportion to their development. The colleges can develop only as these three belts of resources develop. At present, there are enough colleges for a long period. They have, however, progressed beyond the stage of entire dependence on material resources and will be increasingly dependent on craftsmanship in education."

#### *Higher Education in Nebraska*

CHANCELLOR S. P. CAPEN

The Secretary's office used as a focus for the study spondence and through consulting printed documents. Doane College. The study was made largely by corre-

spondence and through consulting printed documents. About half of it deals with the situation of Doane College itself. This portion of the report represents an intensive study of that institution. The other half contains a study of the whole collegiate situation in Nebraska.

I regard the report as a very valuable as well as a very interesting document. It is of considerable size, some three hundred pages, and I can not tell you very much about it in the few moments that I shall take. There are one or two points, however that are worth calling to your attention.

The study lays a great deal of stress on the state itself, the characteristics of its population and its industries and the possibilities of development, as far as these can be foreseen. In Nebraska there seem to be very definite limitations on the possible growth of population. The distribution of population has largely determined the present location of institutions. The distribution and the limitations will affect the future location in parallel to those existing in a number of other states in the country. All of the Nebraska institutions, with a single exception, are located in a relatively small area in the eastern part of the state, so close to one another that their respective territories inevitably overlap. The institutional congestion, being so great, it seems very unlikely that all of them can permanently thrive. These facts are shown in considerable detail in the portion of the study that deals with the state educational situation as a whole.

There is also a very interesting section which relates to the college curricula of all the institutions in the state. I may say for those who do not happen to know the Nebraska situation that there are five state institutions of collegiate rank, namely the state university and four state teachers' colleges which grant degrees, and fourteen or fifteen endowed denominational institutions. Nebraska has a population of about one million and a

quarter. All of the curricula of these institutions are analyzed in the same manner in which the Association office analyzed the curricula in the Colorado study last year. The semester hours offered in the several departments and the semester hours earned are shown. A mathematical ratio is worked out which indicates what each institution is giving in comparison with others. It is a laborious process but not particularly complicated. As applied to a single institution it is not very significant, it seems to me, but as applied to a group of institutions it is exceedingly significant. I think that this portion of the study is the most interesting and useful part of it and while I haven't time to elaborate the results, I commend them to your attention when the study is published. They reveal with very great clarity the general poverty and lack of balance in the curriculum offerings throughout that state.

The study concludes with an intensive survey of Doane College, showing what its evolution has been and what its present and probable future resources are or are likely to be. There is a rather exhaustive examination of its curriculum and of the costs of instruction and operation. Those are details which can hardly be fitted into a brief report like this.

As far as formal recommendations are concerned the study does not go very far. It culminates rather in a few tentative suggestions as to how the whole situation for the smaller privately supported institutions may be rescued, if it may be rescued at all.

The authors of the study believe, and they furnish a great deal of evidence to support their beliefs, that it is practically impossible for so many institutions to persist in that area with that population, prospects of development being what they are. Probably a few of them may survive and grow strong. Doane College is the one among the private institutions that has the best prospects. The way out for any institution seems to be to



offer something quite distinctive. Evidently the offerings in all Nebraska colleges are substantially the same. Such differentiation as there is, is largely due to differences in material support. If differentiation is possible for any one of them, Doane College seems to be the one with the best opportunity. It should be along the line also of elevating standards and making more searching selection of student personnel.

The study finally makes the interesting suggestion that the best hope of the endowed denominational colleges is to treat their problem as a common one, to work together as a unit to supply a type of education which is not supplied and never can be supplied through the agency of the state institutions. In other words, it is suggested that they forget, if they can, the denominational lines that have separated them in the past and study the higher educational situation in Nebraska as a common problem in Christian higher education.

*The Field and Constituency of the Higher Institutions  
in Arkansas*

DR. GEORGE F. ZOOK

According to statistics gathered by the Bureau of Education in 1920-21 there were 3,094 residents of Arkansas attending universities and colleges, or one college student to every 566 people in the state. Comparing the population of Arkansas which was in college with that of other states in the Union, it was found that Arkansas ranked next to the last, only Tennessee being lower in the proportion of people in college.

At the same time the statistics revealed the fact that 1264 or 31.9 per cent of the 3094 students went out of the state to secure their university or college education, while only 190 students came in from other states to replace them. In other words, while there were 3094 residents

of the state in college, there were only 2020 students attending the Arkansas colleges.

From these figures it is quite clear that higher education in Arkansas is in a backward condition. There are, of course, several reasons for this situation. In the first place 27 per cent of the population is colored. Also the percentage of the population from five to eighteen years of age in school, according to the last census figures, was only 69. On the other hand, it may be pointed out that eight Southern States, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia, all exceed Arkansas in the percentage of negro population. Furthermore, seven states, all in the South, fall below Arkansas in the proportion of their population in the elementary and secondary schools.

From these facts it seems clear that Arkansas is more backward in higher education than her condition in elementary and secondary education seems to necessitate, and furthermore, that the colleges of the state are not adequately occupying the limited field which is open to them. The primary reason is that without exception all are as yet too weak to command the attention of high school graduates. None of them are able to exert sufficient drawing power to prevent a large portion of the high school graduates from going to other states for their college education.

In making an inspection of the colleges of Arkansas two years ago, I learned that the weakness of the colleges was caused in considerable part by the feeling that each denomination should support at least two higher institutions, one for young men and another for young women. Indeed the Southern Methodist and the Southern Baptists, just to show that they are not partial about the separation of the sexes, have each established a co-educational institution also, so that both of these denominations are supporting three colleges. Each branch of the Presbyterian Church is also supporting a college,

while another Presbyterian College is being developed at Memphis, Tennessee, which is as conveniently located for the people of Arkansas as for those of Tennessee.

There is, of course, no doubt, that the considerable number of colleges in Arkansas is an evidence of the zeal exhibited by a great band of self-sacrificing leaders, particularly among the various church denominations, to establish for the young people of Arkansas adequate opportunities for collegiate education. Granting, however, the beneficent influence spread abroad in the state by these leaders and the institutions which they have founded and supported through sacrifice and toil, it is evident that the denominations in Arkansas have been and still are attempting to support a larger number of four-year colleges than the number of college students, and the available income of the institutions, justify.

Whatever arguments there may be for establishing separate institutions for men and women and whatever conditions make it impossible for the two great branches of a Christian church to concentrate on the support of a single institution, it becomes clear at once that the division of the scanty funds which denominations have been able to raise for the support of colleges has resulted in establishing a number of weak, struggling, substandard institutions. For this reason, at the conclusion of the report on the Arkansas colleges, I recommended that the several denominations consider the subject of collegiate education in Arkansas with a view to such reorganization of the institutions they are supporting as to eliminate unnecessary and expensive duplication.

In effecting this reorganization, it was suggested that several of the present institutions, which are four-year colleges in name only, be reduced to junior colleges, with their curricula so organized as to enable the graduates of these junior colleges to continue their work in a single strong four-year college supported by each denomination. In other words, that each denomination

should develop something like a system of higher education rather than scatter its efforts fruitlessly in a number of unrelated institutions. As a result of this recommendation, I am happy to say that the Southern Baptists adopted a plan of this kind. Central College accepted the opportunity to become a junior college and arranged to send its students to Quachita (pronounced Washita) College for their last two years. In this way both institutions have strengthened themselves materially and greatly increased their hold on their constituents.

Somewhat later it was my privilege to recommend to the Baptist Colleges of Tennessee a similar plan which was adopted unanimously by the board in charge of the several institutions.

Although perhaps not included in the general subject of this discussion, it may prove somewhat interesting to recall some of the circumstances concerning the field and constituency of the University of Arkansas as it was revealed by the Bureau's survey of that institution about two years ago.

The university was located in Fayetteville, in the extreme northwestern part of the state, by the trustees in 1871, after Washington County and the city of Fayetteville had agreed to turn over to the trustees county and city bonds aggregating \$130,000, a sum much in excess of that bid by any other community for the location of the university. Another consideration much stressed at the time was the healthful and beautiful site selected by the trustees, not an unusual statement to find in college catalogs of the present day.

The Commission which made the Bureau's survey had grave doubts as to whether the university is properly located. The center of population in Arkansas has in recent years moved conspicuously to the eastward. The distance from important centers of population in the state to Fayetteville, even under the improved railway

conditions of today, is regarded by many people in the state as an obstacle. From Little Rock, Pine Bluff, Arkadelphia and Batesville, the most important centers of population in the state, except Fort Smith, it is respectively 215, 259, 280 and 339 miles to Fayetteville. From two of these cities the trip cannot be made in the daytime. Even from Little Rock, which is the capital and almost the exact geographical center of the state, the most comfortable way to make the trip is by sleeper at night.

In this connection it was interesting to compare the population of Arkansas which was 250 miles from Fayetteville, with that which is the same distance from Little Rock. Out of a total of seventy-five counties only thirty-four, or less than one-half, are within two hundred and fifty miles of Fayetteville. The others vary all the way from 250 miles to 400 miles from Fayetteville. The total population of Arkansas within 250 miles of Fayetteville is about 800,000; more than 250 miles from Fayetteville, about 950,000, or 45% and 55% respectively. On the other hand there is probably not a town or a village in Arkansas which is not within 250 miles by railroad of the capital. Most of them, indeed, are within 175 miles.

There are a number of other difficulties which the university encounters in carrying on its work at its present location. For example, the fact that it is located far from the cotton and rice belts of the state prevents many students from those regions from registering in the agricultural school. There were, for example, in 1920-21, forty-three regular students in agricultural courses of study from five northern or northwestern counties, and only nineteen from the other seventy counties of the state. Under these circumstances it seems clear that the university cannot, except with great difficulty, develop an agricultural college which will graduate students who come from central, eastern and southern Arkansas, and who are willing to return to those regions



as county agricultural agents, teachers of agriculture, and farmers.

At its present location it is also impossible for the university to have extensive contact with the state. The engineering college, for example, should be closely connected with the development of highways. The medical schools should have close relations with the eleemosinary institutions and the public health service. The agricultural college should be easily accessible to carry on necessary control work and to develop extension in agriculture and home economics. Such illustrations show clearly that a modern state university needs to be so located as to enable people to get to it readily and also to enable it to get to the people. For this reason the commission which conducted the survey of the University of Arkansas raised the question frankly as to whether the University of Arkansas ought not to be located nearer the geographical center of the state.

From what has been said concerning the location of the university, it seems clear that Little Rock, the capital, the metropolis, the geographical and railroad center of the state, is a natural, convenient and sensible location for a higher institution. Notwithstanding this fact the state has not, as yet at least, located any of its educational institutions there, except its medical school, and none of the denominations save the Roman Catholics have established a college there.

Such disdain of the centers of population shows how long our higher institutions have clung to the monastic ideal that to save one's soul it was desirable to leave the throng and resort to the wilderness, where sin and temptation were more easily avoided and conquered. No one who has studied history should doubt the strength of character and the quality of scholarship which may be developed in an institution secluded from the centers of population. Nevertheless, it was not always possible even in the Middle Ages to draw students in great num-

bers away from the centers of population. In the same way it is proving necessary today for institutions to be so located as to be able to reach the multitudes readily and to carry the gospel of education to all those who are able and willing to profit by it.

*Higher Education in Oklahoma*

PRESIDENT R. M. HUGHES

Oklahoma has an area about equal to that of Ohio and Indiana combined, 70,470 square miles. The population is very uniformly distributed—2,028,000 in 1920. Oklahoma contains 292 persons per square mile, about the same population per square mile as Minnesota (296). It is more densely populated than Texas, Nebraska, or Kansas. Among forty-eight states Oklahoma is twenty-first in population. It exceeds Nebraska, Kansas, and Washington by 400,000-700,000. It is only slightly smaller in population than Iowa, Minnesota and Virginia. There are 149,000 negroes, 74,825 Indians, 1,821,000 white persons (91% white).

One is struck in reading the names of students in the colleges by the absence of names of foreign derivation. The state is largely settled from Kansas and Texas and the East.

In wealth this state ranks twelfth among the forty-eight, largely due to great oil production. Oklahoma is a great agricultural state with an annual oil production of \$180,000,000.

It is easy to see that the problem of higher education in such a state is a great problem.

The population has nearly tripled since 1900 and private wealth has not thus far been able to do much to meet the needs of the state.

Phillips University at Enid, 549 students, University of Tulsa at Tulsa, 203; Oklahoma City College, Oklahoma City, 200; Oklahoma Baptist Univ., 214; Catholic College

for Men, 134; Oklahoma Presbyterian College for Girls, 46, are the important institutions on private foundations.

The big burden of higher education in Oklahoma falls on the state and the state has accepted the challenge by establishing a state university, a state agricultural college, a woman's college, and six teachers' colleges, enrolling this year, September to June, a total of about 9000 students. Of these, about 1500 are doing work of secondary school grade. About 1500 students are enrolled in the colleges on private foundations, so approximately 9000 students of college grade are enrolled in Oklahoma this year.

Assuming one college student for every 200 of our population as the average for the country, Oklahoma, to maintain this average, would enroll 10,500, only slightly more than are now in college.

The several institutions, including the teachers' colleges, are so distributed that all parts except the extreme corners of the state are within fifty miles of some institution of higher learning. On the other hand, the six most important institutions are included in a circle with a radius of sixty miles having its center seventy miles from the north boundary and about the middle of the state. Here we find the State University, the Agricultural College, the Central Teachers' College, and the three largest private institutions, each located in an important city—Tulsa, Oklahoma City, and Enid.

The University of Oklahoma embraces schools of medicine, law, home economics, journalism, business, social service, education, engineering, fine arts, pharmacy, besides a college of arts and sciences and a graduate school. The Agricultural College embraces schools of agriculture, engineering, home economics, business, education, and science and literature. The Women's College offers courses in liberal arts, home economics, the fine arts, and education. Each of the six teachers' colleges offers courses for the training of teachers for

the lower grades and for the high school, also for training teachers of home economics and agriculture.

In most of these nine state institutions the development in faculties, buildings, and equipment is surprisingly great, considering the relatively short time they have been in existence and the fact that the people of a new state have had to be educated to appropriate money for higher education. The growth of most of the institutions has been so great, however, that equipment, buildings, and staff are inadequate and large increases in appropriations are needed.

The state is spending this year about \$2,115,000 in the operation and maintenance of its nine higher institutions, or, roughly, \$235 per student. This is very inadequate and should be increased from 50 per cent to 100 per cent. Large additions should be made to the land held by the several institutions. All her institutions are in the outskirts of towns or small cities and each should own at least 1 acre for every 25 students anticipated enrollment—40 acres per 1000. In the case of the agricultural college the present holding of 1000 acres should at least be doubled. An annual appropriation for buildings of two and one-half millions a year for ten years would provide adequate plants for the educational work, and dormitories for 5000 to 6000 students. It is highly probable that ten years hence 15,000 students will be enrolled in the state colleges.

An interesting question is what part private foundations will ultimately have in the educational work of Oklahoma. While the writer did not visit Phillips University, University of Tulsa, or Oklahoma City College, these institutions are reported to be substantial church colleges. As time goes on they should secure large endowment and should serve an increasing group of young people, especially from their respective cities.

There are seven cities of from 12,000 to 17,000 population, and one of 30,000, which are without colleges, but

all of them are within fifty miles of one, two, three, or four institutions. If any further institutions are to be established on private foundations it would seem that McAlester or Muskogee in the eastern part of the state would be the most promising locations.

---

## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE

PRESIDENT J. H. T. MAIN

The report of the Commission of the Association of American Colleges is embodied in the following letter which was sent out by the Chairman of the Commission to the Presidents of the colleges included in the Association of American Colleges under date of November 8. Hence this letter with the necessary modifications and with some additional paragraphs is presented as the report of your Commission.

At the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges held in Chicago several years ago a Committee on Architecture was appointed at the request of the American Institute of Architects, this committee to confer with a similar committee appointed by the Institute. It was understood that the two committees should meet as occasion might require for the purpose of considering the best methods for developing interest in the schools and colleges of the United States in the important subjects grouped under the head of the Fine Arts. Joint meetings of the committees were held in New York and elsewhere at various times, in addition to personal conferences between individual members of the committees. These conferences led finally to the definite conclusion, approved unanimously, that a book should be prepared and published under the auspices of the Committee on Education of the Institute, entitled "The Significance of the Fine Arts."

After reaching this conclusion there was a prolonged dis-



cussion as to the best method of preparing the book. It was agreed by all members of the Committee that it should be the work of a number of experts qualified to speak with authority on the various divisions of the general subject. It was agreed, also, that the book should be prepared with a view to securing the interested attention of the general reader as well as the attention of educators who might wish to make use of it, or recommend it, for text-book purposes in schools and colleges.

The Committee on Education of the American Institute of Architects immediately proceeded to carry out the instructions of the joint committee. The book is now just off the press and there is every reason for believing that it will be a volume of outstanding importance as an introduction, authoritative as far as it goes, to the various branches of the Fine Arts.

Educators, with practical unanimity, agree that the subject of art in schools and colleges has been neglected. They are convinced of its importance as a cultural element in education and as a real contribution to the interpretation of life and civilization. The book will meet a need and provide an introduction to the art realm that we are sure will be appreciated by the general public and by teachers and officers in the colleges of the United States.

The first part of the book deals with Architecture. The importance of this branch of the subject can hardly be overestimated as an essential element in the educational process. A student who lives for four years under the shadow of buildings that comply with standards accepted as true and beautiful in architecture cannot fail to assimilate something of those qualities in his own life. The result is sure to be a contribution to his higher life through all the years to come. There is every reason to believe that the immediate future will show a notable advance in the architectural type of our college buildings. It is hoped that it will be so. It will be a silent but immensely significant addition to our education apparatus.

The second part of the book deals with Painting, Sculp-

ture, the Industrial Arts, Landscape Design, and Music. Every subject treated in both parts of the book should make an immediate appeal to the artistic and educational ideals of the present day. There are ten chapters in the book; four in the first part and six in the second. These chapters are written by such outstanding artists and specialists as C. Howard Walker, Ralph Adams Cram, H. Van Buren Magonigle, Paul P. Cret, Bryson Burroughs, Lorado Taft, Huger Elliott, Frederick Law Olmstead, Edward H. Bennett and Thomas Whitney Surette.

These names are sufficient proof of the quality of the book. We hope that the book will be placed in all college and public libraries and will be used in college classes where art courses are already established and moreover lead to the establishment of art courses in many colleges where such courses do not exist. Your committee without reservations recommends the book for general and for education purposes.

Enclosed with the letter sent out to the Presidents of the Colleges there was a circular prepared by the Committee on Education of the American Institute of Architects giving detailed information concerning the book. Your Commission feel that they have done the work assigned to them the result of which appears in the form of an extremely valuable book on the Fine Arts. This book represents the judgment of your Commission and the Committee of the American Institute of Architects as to the best method of bringing the subject of the Fine Arts to the attention of the faculties and students of American Colleges.

Of course, this book, simply as a book in the college libraries, will avail but little in achieving the purpose in view. The purpose in view is to lead multitudes of students in our American colleges to an appreciative acquaintance with the Fine Arts—especially Architecture. In order to do this the book should be introduced into the colleges as the basis of actual class-room study. If this is done, under conditions that are reasonably adequate, the results

will prove to be a contribution of extraordinary richness to education in the Liberal Arts. The book if used for class purposes should lead to a new understanding of the direct value of Architecture as one of the Fine Arts.

There have been enormous sums of money expended on college buildings without any reference to proper grouping or to architectural dignity. A grouping of buildings, on a properly designed campus, constructed in accordance with simple and chaste architectural standards, has an art and a life value which the students, certainly a majority of them, will assimilate unconsciously. Architectural simplicity and dignity may be secured without the expenditure of large sums of money. If this could be impressed upon college boards and if proper steps were taken by college boards to secure work of this sort the colleges of this country in their visible outlines, would be real promoters of cultural education.

It is manifestly impossible for every college to have an art gallery containing examples of great masterpieces in painting and sculpture. But it is possible for every college, even with limited means at its disposal, to contribute to the elevation of life by careful attention to its campus program.

Hence the Commission renews with all possible emphasis its recommendation that the book be used for class room purposes in the colleges included in the Association of American Colleges.

THE RELATION OF THE FINE ARTS TO  
COLLEGE EDUCATION

MR. GEORGE C. NIMMONS, F. A. I. A.

The Relation of the Fine Arts to College Education is a subject that can properly be brought to the attention of educators each year with increasing insistence, because there is strong evidence of a growing demand for art by the people of this country.

As the character of the people has always been reflected to an important degree by their educational institutions, and as any important changes in the aims and ambitions of the people must sooner or later produce a corresponding change in the teaching of schools or colleges, I desire first, to direct your attention to the present status of the people, and to an inquiry as to whether there is evidence of any new tendency, or any new aims or ambitions of the people, which may have an important bearing upon our subject of "The Relation of the Fine Arts to College Education."

There are always those periods in the existence of a nation when things go satisfactorily and progress runs more or less in a groove, but we are in a period now of very radical changes. Part of these changes were occasioned by the war and part of them by our own inventions and discoveries, and by causes which seem formerly to have existed dormant in the nature of the people.

President Harding, in his last message to Congress, speaks of a great crisis, through which not only our own country, but the whole world, is passing, which he said had to do with an economic readjustment and change of the old social and economic order.

In recent years we have had a great influx of people from southern Europe, mostly from the ranks of peasants and common labor, whose coming has created one of our most difficult national problems. Some of our largest cities have

now as high as seventy or eighty per cent of foreign population. Their ideals of government and social order are far different from ours. Some of these people have been absorbed into the national life and have made good citizens. But there are millions of them, at this critical time, who naturally have little concern or sympathy for the principles upon which our Government is founded and are only too ready to oppose the existing order and try some change which would plunge this country into the difficulties or dangers over which the President is so much concerned.

It seems appropriate, even though I digress momentarily from my subject, to note that the one great agency which is relied upon more than any other to make good citizens out of the children of these foreign people, is the teaching of the public schools and colleges. There is no greater service being rendered in this way than by those colleges which have military training, conducted by regular army officers appointed by the Government. Students in these colleges are being trained not only for the Reserve Corps to defend the country in time of need, but they are also disciplined and taught self-control, respect for law and order, and a love and affection for the flag.

In connection with this phase of our subject it is important to point out one very pronounced tendency or characteristic of our foreign population; that is their sincere love for art. Wherever there is an art gallery, accessible to them, it will be found that there will be a large proportion of these people in attendance, who will derive a keen enjoyment and pleasure from the works of art on exhibit. One needs no greater evidence of their sincere appreciation of the opera than to observe the number of them who will purchase standing room at the opera, and voluntarily stand for three hours and apparently enjoy the entire performance to its end. This true appreciation of art is in their blood, and the significant thing is that they form a large and important part of our population. It is also significant that this love for art, so prevalent among



these people, is an attribute of their character, which, if encouraged and developed as it deserves to be, may serve as an important means by which their amalgamation into our national life may be hastened and their loyalty and patriotism increased.

The Late Count Leon N. Tolstoi, that great student of art, whose definition and theory of art is held in such high esteem, said in effect that art is the agency by which the human emotions and feelings are most effectively communicated one to another, and that where true art abounds that it acts as a great force in drawing men together in a brotherhood of universal sympathy and regard for each other.

Among the causes other than the war to which the great changes now going on may be attributed, are good roads, automobiles, trolleys, and other means of transportation, which have made available to the majority of the people the amusements and cultural advantages of towns and cities; the various labor-saving machines, the invention of the phonograph, the cinematograph, and the radio; the change in the mode of living of city people; the growing popularity of amusements and sports and the vast distribution of inexpensive literature.

The changes that have come about in home life are quite marked. Most of the former activities have disappeared from it except housekeeping and cooking, and a little repairing of wearing apparel. Even a large part of the cooking has disappeared from the so-called kitchenette apartment, of which there are so many now being built in cities. Nearly all of the home activities in making clothing and preparing food materials have been displaced by factory production. The furnishing and equipment of a modern house or apartment and the complete list of its necessary supplies that are to be had by a call over the telephone, have made available many hours of leisure that did not formerly exist. In fact, it is a fair question whether or not the young house-wife, situated, as she so often is, in

a kitchenette apartment, with hours of idleness at her disposal, is not greatly in need of some of that happy and wholesome occupation such as the home of our grandmothers, with its spinning wheel and numerous other essential home industries, supplied.

How great would be the advantage to that young housewife of a sufficient knowledge of the industrial arts or even of design and color, to enable her to employ some of these idle hours in doing things with her hands and in making useful and ornamental things for her little home.

In the organizations and methods of conducting the business and industries of the country there have been made very decided changes. The hours of work have been materially shortened. Assuming that the average working time is eight hours, the time for meals two, and for sleep eight, there remain six hours of leisure time every working day, which is from thirty to fifty per cent more time than was available formerly outside of working hours.

All of these changes in the habits and customs of the people are bringing about opportunities to indulge more and more in new interests outside of the daily routine of work.

If it were spent in idleness, the effect would be degenerating, and the people in that case would be better off to be fully occupied with their daily tasks up to the sleeping hours, as they once were when they worked twelve and more hours a day. But they are not spending their leisure time as a rule in idleness. A large part of it is given over to moving picture theatres, the radio, the phonograph, the pianoplayer, the community center entertainments, the theater, the concert hall, and other kinds of entertainments and amusements. Then there is the growing popularity of outdoor sports, such as golf, and the general indulgence in driving in automobiles, for the enjoyment of the scenery and landscape effects of parks and country.

Further changes going on in our daily life in this very critical time of our existence might be described, but those

above referred to serve to indicate clearly the direction in which the people are bending their efforts, in the employment of the newly acquired leisure time. This new tendency of the people is not towards science but it is toward art.

The question as to whether or not the kind of art production indulged in is always of the highest form is not as important to discuss as the fact that the great masses of the people, who formerly had little or no time for anything of this kind, are now being influenced continuously in their lives by the refining and cultural effects of art productions. The fact that these people are seeking in one form or another some expression of beauty through the agency of art, to which they have found a sympathetic response in their own natures, is a matter of vital importance in the make-up of their character.

If we were to seek the most outstanding evidence as to an important expression of art tendencies that are beginning to manifest themselves in the American people, there is probably none as positive and conclusive as the great movement that has recently spread all over the country, to replan and beautify the cities in which these people live.

There are already one hundred of the principal cities, and numerous small ones, in this country, that have passed or are in the process of passing what are called zoning ordinances. These ordinances have been declared legal and constitutional by various state supreme courts, and are created in each city by its Board of Aldermen and enforced through the agency of the police power in each case.

The object of these ordinances is to determine the most practical, convenient, and beautiful locations for all the kinds of buildings, and uses to which city property may be put. Industries, business and other activities, are always segregated and zoned in parts of the city where they most properly belong. The residences and homes are given permanent locations and made secure against encroachments of objectionable buildings or other institutions.

As a basis or foundation for these zoning ordinances, there is in nearly every case a comprehensive city plan, for the development and relocation of streets, boulevards, parks, and public grounds of all kinds, and provisions for transforming and developing the natural features of each vicinity.

An example of the transformation of a great city according to one of these plans may be found right here in Chicago. The official plan of this city was originally called the "City Beautiful Plan of Chicago." It was suggested and inspired by the beauty of the World's Columbian Exposition. The late Daniel H. Burnham created it, and its execution in concrete form is being carried on now by Mr. Charles H. Whacker.

The people of the whole city have adopted this plan, and voluntarily are taxing themselves to pay for its execution. One means adopted of giving publicity to it was the preparing of a text book on the subject which the scholars going through the public schools were obliged to study. As a result the school children, as well as their parents, know about the Chicago plan.

The plan provides not only for the present transformation of the city, but for its future development, whereby the principal streets and boulevards, the public buildings and institutions, its residences, business and industrial buildings, its railroads and terminals, and its play grounds, parks, and forest preserves shall be so located and provided for, that the greatest degree of utility, sanitation, convenience and beauty may be secured.

The carrying out of this plan is already involving the giving up of large areas of private property, the widening of streets and the building of new ones, and the carrying on of vast constructions and other undertakings.

The most wonderful feature of this plan is the transformation of the entire waterfront of the city. The city once had a natural and attractive lake shore all along its east side, but as the city developed, it gave it away largely

to the use of its industries. Now it proposes to get this waterfront back and is already engaged in filling in and constructing a new lake shore outside of the old one. This time, however, the new lake shore is to have all the features and beauties which the best talent of landscape art can devise.

According to present plans it will not be long before the once dirty, unattractive, great industrial city of Chicago will be transformed into one which, according to Mr. Burnham, the founder of the plan, will have the most beautiful waterfront of any city in the world. For some thirty miles, the entire extent of the city along Lake Michigan, there will be a continuous stretch of parks, play grounds, lagoons, islands, boulevards, drives and walks, all landscaped, and defined by the planting of trees, shrubs, lawns, and flowers, so as to bring out the maximum of beauty in the land and water scenery and turn this waterfront of a great commercial city into a veritable fairyland.

In this great undertaking to transform a city we have a striking illustration of a community of over three million people, eighty per cent of whom are foreigners, all joined together in harmony of purpose, in striving to attain beauty in the reconstruction of their city. This pertains to a more or less extent not only to one but to over one hundred cities in the United States. Throughout the country not only the city people but the farmers are spending a good part of their leisure time in listening to and seeing art productions. The indications on every hand are that the people are turning towards art. They are striving with a new enthusiasm and a new ambition in one case to express themselves in the rebuilding of their cities, through the arts of architecture, city planning, and landscape architecture, and in the other, to enjoy and appreciate the products of the arts of music, picture drama, painting, sculpture, and to a more or less extent the activities of the other arts.

It is this new very pronounced tendency of the people or rather the striking development of a new trait in their



character with which we are most deeply concerned; because there seems to be no doubt but that the changes which have already taken place, and those which are still going on, in the habits and customs of the people, and in their aims and ambitions, are of sufficient moment to have a very decided effect upon the educational system of the country. It seems inconceivable that the people who have embarked upon such ambitious schemes of beautifying their cities, and who are devoting so much of their leisure time to the various arts, will not demand that their children shall have art instruction as a part of their education.

I take it, therefore, that this subject of art instruction is a most timely one, and one which the constituency of a college will need no urging to accept, as they come more and more to realize its important bearing upon daily life. Indeed, it appears as if the former situation of an unsympathetic public was reversed, and that a college which does not sooner or later give a fair degree of instruction in art will be behind the times, and likely to be considered unresponsive in its teaching to a well defined demand that is growing out of this new tendency of the people.

In addition to these relatively new reasons for art instruction in college, there remain the old ones which are just as urgent and important as they ever were.

The subject when discussed in all its phases is one, of course, entirely beyond the scope of this discourse, but there are a few outstanding features of the relation of the fine arts to education which may be briefly referred to.

A study of the fine arts is one of the best means that can be employed for training the mind, developing and refining the judgment, and for obtaining a fund of information that is useful and practical throughout life.

The need and benefits of making art instruction an integral part of the education of the American people, are so great and so vital for their well being, that such an undertaking is worthy of the most universal consideration and support.

Whether the average layman realizes it or not the activities of art are a part of his every day life. The home where he lives is filled with the products of art. They may be good or bad according to his standards of taste, irrespective of what they cost. His family are destined to live along under the potent influence of those surroundings which may represent all that is coarse, crude, and ugly, or all that is refined, good and beautiful. Here in childhood are formed man's standards of judgment of what is fitting, appropriate and beautiful, and these standards are bound to have a profound influence for good or evil throughout the rest of his life.

A knowledge of art will tend to make the home, even with limited means, what it might well be as an influence for what is good, appropriate and beautiful in its surroundings.

The streets and buildings of the town or city in which a man lives are largely the products of art. The character of these things is determined in the main by the people. The city planner, landscape architect, and architect may design it all, but the people always make such designs and plans conform to their own standards of taste. And so every community is an example of the character of its people. If they have no knowledge of art, they cannot possibly direct such work properly, and their town or city is likely to be ugly, not well adapted for the essential activities, and marked in prominent locations with buildings that give further evidence of their ignorance of what is good architecture.

A limited knowledge and understanding of architecture, city planning and landscape design, would tend to make such communities beautiful and delightful places in which to dwell, and their provisions for the social, industrial and business life not only ample and well suited for present needs but also for future growth and development.

No matter what a man's calling or profession may be, products of art. A clergyman has his church, a doctor his his life is full of instances in which he has to do with the

hospital, a lawyer the improvement of his client's property, a business man his office and commercial building, a manufacturer his industrial plant, and they all have their part in the erection of the city hall, court-house, churches, schools, colleges, and other public buildings which form the center of social and public life. The layout and the treatment of streets, the public parks, play grounds, and whatever physical features a city may have, are determined and created by the people according to their standards of the different arts involved.

The personal appearance of a man, his dress, his intimate belongings, his amusements, and sometimes even his tombstone are what his knowledge of the arts make them, so that every person by his very appearance and his belongings proclaims, without uttering a word, whether or not he has good taste, refinement, and an intelligent judgment concerning all of those important affairs of life which have to do with art.

As to the part which art plays in industry, the greatest activity of our times, much can be said of the importance of art.

All manufactured articles which depend in any degree for their sale upon a structural design of an attractive appearance, are at once in some way the products of art. Those principles which control in determining the design, color, and often the function of such manufactured products are identically the same principles upon which some of the fine arts are founded. A manufacturer, therefore, who is ignorant of those few simple principles of design and color which are the basis of all good architecture and industrial design, is severely handicapped.

Of all the benefits and advantages received from a study of art there are none greater or more to be desired than those which brighten the pathway of life and add true pleasure and joy to the life of the individual in the pursuit of his destiny.

Whatever the differences may be among philosophers as to the exact definition of art, there can be no quarrel about

the uplifting moral influence of true art properly applied to the home, the city, and in the various vocations and wholesome amusements which occupy the life of the average person.

The study of art will reveal to the student new sources of pleasure, of which he was unconscious previously by reason of his ignorance of their existence, and his inability to appreciate them. To appreciate art one must prepare to understand it. One is born with a certain amount of ability to understand the objects of art, but such inherited ability usually comprehends only the simplest elementary manifestations of art, such as the strongest colors, the boldest forms, the most striking contrasts, or the simplest disconnected melodies in music.

All the more important and most valuable messages of art, are more or less a closed book, to the person whose art appreciation has never been developed.

The average person today is not essentially different as far as his feelings and emotions are concerned than he was a thousand or more years ago. When a person creates something or does something which we call art, he feels a pleasure or an emotion which he puts into, or expresses in, the thing he is making or doing.

The task, if it is a work of art, becomes transformed, it is a labor of love, into which goes his best skill and his greatest efforts which are responding to, or rather expressing and manifesting the joy or emotions that are within him.

The undertaking does not stop there, the function of art is not complete unless there be at least another person who can appreciate that work, and experience the same joy or emotion which the artist felt when he produced that work of art. The object of art may be the product of the moment or the labor of a lifetime. It may be a simple piece of embroidery, or it may be a bronze or marble masterpiece of the world. But the message of the artist is locked within, and yet it is always accessible to all who may have the understanding and knowledge of art to appreciate it.

Mr. President: It is now my privilege to present to you the first copy of the book which the Committee on Education of the American Institute of Architects, assisted by your Committee on the Fine Arts, has produced. Its production has required much time and effort during the last four years by busy men whose services could not have been secured except for the great altruistic object for which the book was created. The ten distinguished artists who joined in the work, wrote the text and selected the illustrations, are men of such standing as should make the work authoritative and truly representative and expressive of the standards of the art of our day.

All through the difficulties in bringing this undertaking to a successful conclusion, the men behind it were spurred on by the hope that the Association of American Colleges would not cease its efforts for the great cause of art until, there was at least some form of art instruction incorporated in the curriculum of every college in its association.

I have the honor, Mr. President, to present to you on behalf of the Committee on Education of the American Institute of Architects, the first copy of "The Significance of the Fine Arts."

### COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE

MR. C. C. ZANTZINGER, F. A. I. A.

The subject of this paper is a broad one and may be approached from many different angles. Manifestly, to fully carry its message, it must be illustrated, and for this purpose I will show you presently some slides to make my argument more clear. In selecting these slides from a great mass of material which may be regarded as illustrative of my subject, I have been forced to consider the time that has been allotted to the consideration of this paper and, while I could have discussed the historic aspect and the gradual development of colleges not only in this country but abroad, I find that I must confine my detailed consideration of this



subject to the problems of the present day. It is after all these, and the proper approach to them, which will most interest this Convention.

In undertaking the physical development of a college, our object should be to take counsel and proceed advisedly. Our watchword, therefore, is "Forethought." Well designed buildings, thoughtfully grouped in good relation to one another, have their own educational and cultural influence upon the student body. They are a link in the chain of the development of the appreciation of art which should I believe be an essential part of college education.

Many considerations should govern us in determining upon a group plan for a college or any other institution. In the first place, it is essentially uneconomical to build at random. By proper planning we can prepare for that which will be needed and can build part by part or building by building as the need for these develops. The group plan is a definition of our ambitions for the institution. As the opportunity for further construction offers it insures that memorials or gifts to the institution will be placed in relation to future growth, thus avoiding the haphazard placing of buildings where they may hamper future development.

The physical well being of the student body must be considered, that is, questions of orientation and hygiene must be solved in placing buildings upon the site. The site's availability for its several uses, that is, academic, residential, or recreational or athletic, must be borne in mind.

While the attainment of our object of forethought is difficult, let us not lose sight of the opportunity that goes hand in hand with it. We have spoken of the educational value of these new buildings. We should see in them the artist's opportunity to express our civilization. Art is the flower of every civilization and here in these new buildings lies a great opportunity for this flower to flourish, for college buildings are by their very nature permanent. The sites which are today selected are chosen, among other things, for the opportunities of growth which they offer, and thus

the buildings which we erect about the college campus will stand long after many now erected in the cities have been torn down and given place to other structures. Recognize that the life of the average building in New York City is only twenty years and, therefore, that in the span of a lifetime a single individual may see three different structures, serving different purposes, erected on the same site. Mr. Nimmons has spoken of the benefits of zoning and it is to be regretted that as yet zoning laws have not been universally adopted. Therefore only on such special sites as are afforded by institutions can we look forward with reasonable certainty to the buildings of today remaining to tell of our civilization to the generations that come after. The opportunity, therefore, which is open to you, as the directors of college development, and to us, as the architects of your buildings, is a responsibility which should be approached with a realization of what we owe to the art of our time.

Now, the problem of college development naturally divides itself into three headings: (1) the Urban, that is, the institution in the city; (2) the Suburban, which may well include both the institution in the outskirts of the great city and that in the small town; and (3) the institution in the Country.

Now, all these headings are influenced by certain general conditions. On any site there may be existing buildings which should be preserved; a site may be either flat or at different levels; and every piece of land will be affected in its development by its relation to its approaches and its rail communication. More broadly still, there is the question of climate, which of course varies from one extreme to the other all over the country. And again, in the detailed consideration of a site, we must bear in mind the general problems of orientation.

To these considerations of the site proper, we must add at the outset the thought necessary to determine the style of architecture in which the buildings will be erected. Re-

member that we of today are the heirs of all artistic tradition and that again we have our artistic responsibility to express our time. Now, architectural expression (that is, the style to be determined upon), is influenced by available materials; by economy; by fitness (that is, its adaptability for the expression of the purpose of these buildings), and finally, by that indeterminate element of personal taste.

Before passing to an illustration of the three headings above mentioned, let us consider for a moment the antecedents of the American college. I believe that we must look to England for earlier solutions of a similar problem, and naturally, therefore, we turn to Oxford and Cambridge. In Oxford, the earlier, we find a succession of small quadrangles, placed one without regard to the other, with the resulting charming vistas through archways with buildings in sharp perspective. At Cambridge on the other hand, we find the more monumental conception of plan, the longer vista or axis with great buildings placed at dominating points.

To attempt to illustrate fully the beauties of these two great institutions would be to confine my time before you to this agreeable subject and fail to illustrate the argument I have outlined.

Let us, then, cross the water and see at the University of Virginia the realization of the first well conceived general plan in this country. Here a college graduate, an American gentleman of culture of his time, Thomas Jefferson, understood the problem and had the knowledge and ability—yes, let me state the exact fact, this gentleman of culture had the appreciation of art—to understand what was wanted and to lay out a great ensemble, dedicated to the housing of the needs of the institution of his day and admitting of future growth as the college developed. There is perhaps nothing finer in college architecture than this group dominated by the library at one end of the campus, and the whole adapted to serve its purpose in the climate of the state where it was built.

Let me reiterate that this plan was the conception not of an architect but a gentleman of culture of his period. The college education of his time had afforded him an insight into the arts and when he came to serve his state, when the responsibility was placed upon him to guide the development of a great institution, he was able, by reason of this equipment which was common to all men of culture of those days, to grasp and to solve the problem in this simple, dignified and suitable way that remains as an inspiration to us. For some reason, as yet unexplained, this part of the education of the college man—that is, subjects bearing upon the fine arts and their appreciation—has been excluded from the curricula of colleges in America little by little until today these subjects form no essential part of any undergraduate course unless it be that of a student devoting himself to the fine arts as a specialty. Coincidental with the gradual elimination of these subjects there came a decline in the public taste, marked by expressions in the way of architecture on the campuses of many of our colleges which we will do well to pass over in this discussion. There is nothing to be gained by condemning them. They have perhaps a certain traditional or sentimental value. It may well be that they should be saved, kept for future generations to consider as expressing the civilization of the days that produced them. It is possible that with time our descendants may see in them something that we fail to see and therefore there may be good reason for maintaining the buildings that appeal to us as quite unsuitable. At any rate, in the discussion of this subject today they carry no message, and I will, therefore, pass over a considerable period, beginning here a discussion of my three subdivisions of the college problem, namely the Urban, the Suburban and the Country.

As illustrations of the *Urban*, let us consider Columbia University in New York City (McKim, Mead & White), the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston (Welles Bosworth), and the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia (Cope & Stewardson).

The site of Columbia was advantageous, unhampered by

existing buildings. The style selected is the modern Italian Renaissance, carried up in the generality of buildings to a considerable number of stories. The approach to the site is simple.

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the land was flat and unhampered by existing buildings. The style is essentially modern, an adaptation of the Classic as a veneer or decoration of the concrete cage. The approach is along the river bank.

At the University of Pennsylvania, the site, though flat, is cut up by the city streets, and is hampered by many existing older buildings. The style selected for the new structures is an architecture of brick and stone, inspired from the English Renaissance and earlier Italian forms.

For the second category, namely *Suburban*, let us consider Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, (Frank Miles Day and Grosvenor Attebury,) University of Wisconsin, Madison, (W. P. Laird and P. P. Cret,) and the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (Cass Gilbert).

At Johns Hopkins the site was ample, in a rolling country deeply indented by a ravine. The style adopted was inspired from the old mansion of "Homewood" that stood upon the grounds. The approach is simple from the main highway, leading to the heart of Baltimore.

At the University of Wisconsin, we have a rolling site again, but hampered by existing buildings. The approach was determined by the city streets. It is interesting to note the distribution of the buildings in that on the higher ground we find the residential group and then about the railway the power house and engineering buildings.

At the University of Minnesota the site is a splendid piece of land, rising from the river and cut by main arteries of travel between the Twin Cities.

For my third category, that is "*In the Country*," I take Princeton University, Princeton (Cram & Ferguson and Day & Klauder), Wellesley College, Wellesley (Day &



Klauder), and the Rice Institute, Houston, Texas (Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson).

At Princeton, in the University proper, the site is generally flat but hampered by many existing buildings. The architect has been able to develop a central axis and group about it, with a certain degree of formality, the principal university structures, relegating the dormitory groups and other subdivisions to one side or the other. The style that has been selected is the English Collegiate. This has, however, been developed with the assistance of a very beautiful local stone until it becomes quite a thing by itself, a truly American expression of this beautiful style. The approach to the campus is from the main street of the village.

At Wellesley, the site is one of peculiar difficulty—a series of hillocks unrelated. Therefore, the buildings or groups that have been created on the summits of these stand alone, each independent of the other. Here again the style that has been selected is that of the Collegiate Gothic and its expression has been influenced by the materials available. The approach to the college property is from the main highway and each group of buildings is reached independently without the possibility of covered intercommunication, due to the conditions on the site.

At the Rice Institute, the architect was given a perfectly flat site in the open country, unhampered by existing buildings. He, therefore, developed an ideal grouping about a main axis with minor cross-axes, as was possible with the conditions of the problem. The approach of course was simple.

To these examples of larger institutions in the country, I add the Graduate College at Princeton, (Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson,) as a smaller self-contained unit that may be particularly interesting to the members of this convention. The court is enclosed by the buildings and the whole forms an entity susceptible of growth by the addition of further courts or quadrangles. Here again is to be seen the beautiful architecture that has been developed through the fortun-

ate discovery of the local stone. There is no relation between the Graduate College and the rest of the University, I mean, in the sense of there being any physical connection.

So much for the discussion of the general problem as stated. From these typical instances you have been able to see how the designers have approached their problems, and how the limiting conditions of site have influenced the development. I have given you the names of the architects who have been most closely identified with the development of the various plans which we have considered. The larger institutions have sometimes found it well to appoint the authors of their general plan to a permanent position, known as that of "Supervising Architect," thus making it possible for these designers to work with others as the authors of individual buildings or groups.

No discussion of the general subject of College Architecture would be complete without some specific mention of the dormitory groups which form an integral part of every college development. I have selected the following:

The Harvard Freshman Dormitories,  
The Princeton Dormitories,  
The Williams Dormitories,  
The University of Pennsylvania Dormitory, Triangle  
and Quadrangle,  
The Cornell Dormitories, and finally,  
The new Harkness Memorial Quadrangle at Yale.

All of these are interesting as the solution of the dormitory problem in the materials selected and influenced by either existing buildings or considerations of taste.

The dormitory problem is one to which the architect has been able in recent years to give a great deal of attention and, therefore, in the consideration of it you will find a gradual development of economy in standards which is very interesting.

As to the best method of procedure for the institution that is undertaking development, my advice is very simple. The best thing to do is for your college authorities, through

a building committee made up of trustees and faculty, to draw up a brief of their requirements and then to appoint an architect. It is essentially the province of our profession to study the proper expression in plan and in the eventual building of these requirements. Consequently, I say, appoint your architect and proceed as he directs; depending upon the magnitude of your problem the necessity for the division of the work in the hands of "supervising" and "executive" architects will appear.

Allow me, Mr. President, to take this occasion to express my appreciation of the opportunity given me by your Association to speak before this convention. I would like to regard this occasion as the forerunner of a closer and more useful co-operation between this Association and the American Institute of Architects.

---

## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP

PRESIDENT FREDERICK C. FERRY

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—

There is nothing that I need to say except this: That the best phases of the movement for better scholarship among under-graduates which the Commission found to present to you at this time seemed to it to be the giving of honors courses in colleges. Accordingly that subject is to be presented on behalf of the Commission by two gentlemen who are recognized as chief authorities on that subject. The Commission hoped to have for you by this time a report on faculty scholarship but has thus far been unable to accomplish the task of producing such a report.

I want to call attention to a movement that started, I think, on the Hudson River, with headquarters at Albany, and that is gradually spreading, which aims to se-

cure better scholarship in the schools and colleges. This movement was inaugurated by the Phi Beta Kappa Society. The Phi Beta Kappa Club of the Upper Hudson has been sending out for a year to schools and colleges men to speak in those institutions for the sake of the encouraging of better scholarship.

We find that the boys and girls have heard nothing about the value and importance of scholarship. At any rate they have heard nothing which seemed to them to have much meaning. A few days ago one of our seniors told me that an announcement that I had made a few days before at chapel had completely "broken him up"; that he had never been so broken up in his life; it had troubled him "ever so much." I said, "What was the announcement?"

He replied, "It was an announcement of the first elections of the year to Phi Beta Kappa. If anybody had ever told me in due season that that thing was coming, and given me some notion of the value of it, I would have been one of that first group. I might just as well have done it, but nobody ever called my attention particularly to the desirability of better scholarship."

The Phi Beta Kappa Club of the Upper Hudson has been doing that for some time, and the neighboring Phi Beta Kappa Clubs are now taking it up. It is a worthy task and it is not without results.

### *Honors Courses in American Colleges*

DR. ISAAC L. KANDEL

The Carnegie Foundation

The increased demand for higher education, stimulated by a popular faith in the college as a training school for leadership, by the publicity given to college athletics, by the glamour of student activities and college spirit, as well as direct advertising, has tended to obscure the real issue, which is not whether too many students are

going to college, but whether the colleges are today organized to render the best service to society through the students that they can absorb.

The increase itself is inevitable, and is not fraught with danger provided that the students come with the requisite preparation. But a genuine danger would lie in the lack of a sincere desire to obtain from college education the best that it can offer and from the absence of social sanctions to uphold and popularize the purposes for which higher institutions are maintained. Too frequently college atmosphere and college spirit are held to be synonymous with "student activities," which, according to a recent observer, include everything but "studies." In the face of this popular attitude, it is not surprising that such matters as scholarship and sincere intellectual purpose find it difficult to maintain themselves.

For this situation, however, the student attitude and public opinion are not wholly to blame. Its development has been encouraged by the prevailing organization of college work. A mechanical system, justified for a time in order to establish easily recognized standards, but which enables a student to qualify for a degree by the accumulation of a certain number of credits, necessarily caters to mediocrity and a lowering of standards on the one hand, and furnishes slight inducement to intellectual exertion except for a minority. The organization tends to standardize mediocrity, which is further intensified by methods of instruction and requirements of class attendance, daily assignments, and periodical tests and examinations, that hold the student in leading strings. The development of intellectual independence and initiative and of a proper attitude to scholarship, which should be the first objectives of a college education, is discouraged by overteaching and overlecturing. The degree is too often a certificate of "what a student has known" rather than "of what he knows or is or can



do." Higher education has grown by accretion and subdivision which have dispersed the student's interest and at the same time has had to contend with the increasing demands of "student activities." In the contest between the ideal of culture and the ideal of manhood the latter has been more successful and the college is failing to produce by a combination of the two a well-rounded personality.

The aims and purposes of higher education have not been clearly defined; the more tangible and spectacular aspects of college life have usurped a preponderant place in the eyes of the public and the students, while on the intellectual side the colleges have not responded adequately to the challenge by creating an atmosphere to foster the academic objectives that they should promote. The primary purpose of the college should be to develop among its students habits of study and vital intellectual interests, to stimulate intellectual effort and power of thought. The present system of schoolmasterly methods parcels out subjects in scraps but leaves no time for leisurely thinking or for the acquisition of scholarly methods of work. Intellectually the student, free in all other activities, is held in leading strings and is subject to external pressure.

We must recognize that in the colleges there are two groups of students whose interests must be considered. There will always be one group to whom the college as at present organized offers all that they may hope to gain from prolonged education. But the important task of restoring to a position of dignity and appreciation that atmosphere of genuine scholarship and sincere intellectual devotion that a college should promote, will not be solved by concentration on this group. The second type, which consists of students not only of more than average ability but also of definite intellectual interests, has hitherto been ignored. Compelled to work side by side with those of mediocre talents, for whom intellectual

pursuits constitute an unpleasant interlude in the otherwise agreeable amenities of college life, and uninspired by the incentive that comes from popular recognition and approval, this group is in danger of falling into habits of loafing and idleness.

In many colleges special courses have been introduced for able students and honors are awarded for general excellence. The latter method is a reward for faithfully meeting the prescribed requirements but does not provide sufficient differentiation nor encourage the development of independent methods of study and the real mastery of any one subject. The system of special courses is hedged around by such high requirements of average records for admission and additional work in a special field without relief from the ordinary requirements that it has not proved popular. The main difference between these special and the regular courses appears to be quantitative rather than qualitative.

The existence of two groups of students, differentiated by interests and ability, has long been recognized by most British universities in the provision of pass and honors courses. The chief distinction between these is that the pass course, like the regular courses in this country, consists of a diversity of prescribed subjects without unity, while the honors courses are marked by unity within a specialized field of knowledge and include more than can be covered by class lectures.

The University of Toronto honors courses provide for intensive specialization in the fields of the candidate's choice, with some options in the selection of minors on the pass level. A higher passing mark is required in honors than in pass courses. In 1921-22 forty-six per cent of the student body in the School of Arts and Sciences were enrolled in honors courses, the eliminations being considerably lower than from the pass courses. The intellectual tone and atmosphere of the

university are determined by the honors students, who carry over into the social activities a prestige distinctly conceded both by the pass students and by public opinion in general. In athletics alone does the pass student play a preponderant part.

The essential contribution of the Toronto system consists in the recognition of the existence of two groups of students, in the differentiated courses within each group, in the raising of academic standards in general by the presence of a selected but sufficiently large body of able students, and in the fact that social and student activities of the institution are the concern of all. These points are of significance and may furnish the starting point for similar experiments in the American college, even though the details of the system itself are not suited to its particular needs and conditions.

A promising beginning has been made in the general direction indicated by the Toronto system but arising more immediately out of the facts already described as confronting authorities in higher education in this country. The movement is still in an experimental stage and is at the present time limited to but four institutions, but although only a year old it may well mark the beginning of a nation-wide reorganization of the college. The four institutions are Barnard College, Carleton College, Smith College, and Swarthmore College. The main features of these four honor systems are similar. They aim to give for the present to a small selected group of students an opportunity for intensive effort in a special field of study with a minimum of lectures and formal work. Specialization is begun in the junior year and the honors students are placed under the supervision either of a special committee or of the head of the department in the subject of their choice. The work consists largely in courses of reading, written papers, individual and group conferences and discussions, class attendance if and when considered desirable, and a final comprehensive examination. Smith College has already

defined the scope of work expected in each field from the honors students. The purpose of the honors plan is clearly stated by Carleton College as follows:

"To secure to students having the requisite ability free opportunity to do work that is superior in point of view of individual initiative, independence, sustained effort, and final scope; to make possible during the latter half of one's college course an integration and a cumulative group of some one body of related truth such as would not be accomplished by a series of disconnected courses."

These experiments will be watched with interest and will undoubtedly be subjected to criticism. They differ from both English and Toronto systems in being adapted to the conditions of American secondary and higher education. The system has the advantage of postponing specialization and of selecting the right type of student after he has had the opportunity to show his worth during the first two years of his college career; whether psychological tests or college records will be the best basis remains to be seen. Other questions that emerge and on which an answer cannot yet be given center round the question of cost and the demands on the time of the faculty. Will the cost of administration be appreciably increased and will additional work fall on all or some instructors? In the experimental stage there is no reason to anticipate any great increase in either direction. The problems will only arise when the student body is evenly divided between ordinary and honors groups. When this stage is reached in the larger institutions, the reduction in the number of sections now maintained and in number of advanced courses now taken by small classes, would set free from class duties sufficient instructors for the supervision of the honors students. Much will depend on the clearness and simplicity of the requirements and outlines for reading and study in the honors sections; much on the size of the groups in the different fields of study.

The fundamental question at issue, however, is whether the student body is to be allowed to increase

at the present rate, which inevitably makes for mass production and consequent mediocrity, or whether advantage is to be taken of the current demand for higher education to revise our notion of what a college is for. The colleges have not on the whole given as much thought as the lower schools to the function they should be expected to perform. Much is written in criticism of college athletics and student activities; literature on college pedagogy is slight. An examination of the tendencies in the philosophy underlying elementary and secondary education would contribute much to vitalize higher education, and in many ways is more pertinent to this stage of intellectual maturity. Further investigation of the psychology of the learning process, of how to study and how to think, have more and more tended to place the emphasis on the purposeful activity of the student himself. The recognition of a definite aim and a clear purpose should stimulate the student to select and organize the material, whether facts or information or theory, necessary for the achievement of the desired result. In other words, the method and spirit of research common in the higher fields of study are today being accepted as sound in their application to the lower schools. The colleges have not yet been affected by this development of educational theory. No doubt there will always be a percentage of students, whether through lack of ability or intellectual interest, for whom the present system must be retained; but the theory amply justifies the direction of the experiment with abler students. The honors system, therefore, undertakes to meet the demands of the time for higher intellectual standards for the whole student body and ensure for the best intellects the finest training compatible with their abilities and interests and with sound educational theory.



*Honors Courses at Swarthmore College*

PRESIDENT FRANK AYDELOTTE

Mr. President and Members of the Association: It was thought by the Executive Committee that I could perhaps best comment on Mr. Kandel's excellent paper by saying a word about what we are doing in this direction at Swarthmore.

I shall, accordingly, speak of our practical honors work allowing myself only one word in regard to the theory. That is to emphasize what Dr. Kandel has said about academic standards in this country. In my opinion, there are two things that we are doing that we ought not to do. We allow the pace, the intellectual pace, in our colleges to be set by the average student, and under our system we penalize independence and initiative while we praise and reward the school-boy virtues of docility and obedience. All of our academic honors penalize the man of strong intellectual interests. If a man is strongly interested in Greek, is a great authority on the subject and you are going to hire him as a Greek professor in your institution, you care very little about what he knows about physics; but if the same man with the same interests is a candidate for Phi Beta Kappa he may be rejected, no matter how good his work in Greek, because of his poor work in physics. The same thing is true of all our academic honors. That in my opinion is unfortunate, and I think it is likewise unfortunate that the intellectual pace should be set by the average.

You may say that the most ambitious man or the abler man may work as hard as he wants to, may do twice as much work on every assignment as the average man. Any college president or any college professor who thinks that is possible has only to take the student's program of engagements and study it. No matter how easy the individual tasks may be for a student, he must do them at specified times and in specified ways. He must keep all his various engagements in class rooms. We have an excellent system

for making the wayward student stay on the track, and for spurring on the laggard. He is sent to a very resourceful Dean and kept in hand by a very remarkable system of punishments and prohibitions. All the punishments and all the regulations are wonderfully devised to make it impossible for a man to get through college without doing any work, and only the brightest students can achieve that wonderful feat.

If those bright students instead of bending their energies to getting through college without working want to put their energies to other uses and to do a lot of work, they find it very difficult to do so because of the interference of this cumbersome academic machinery. We do our duty by the average students, as Dr. Kandel has said, very well; the people we neglect and slight are the better and more ambitious ones.

In our honors courses at Swarthmore, which we have set up in an experimental way this year, we are making an attempt to remedy that situation. We allow our students to volunteer to read for honors at the end of their Sophomore year, and they spend their Junior and Senior years in the honors courses.

We have certain regulations to which they must conform. They must have done a certain amount of mathematics and science, and a certain amount of languages, and so forth, in their first two years. We have at present set up only two of our honors courses and I cannot say what other regulations will be necessary, but in general we expect that honors students will finish all their required courses in the first two years.

We allow students to volunteer for this privilege. We do not force them to do so. We refuse to admit them unless we believe they have the intellectual and, I might say, moral qualities leading to success. We want in our honors groups students with ability and with definite intellectual interests.

We do not base our admission to honors on averages.

We base it on their success in the first two years in the particular kind of work in which they want to read for honors. At Swarthmore we have only five hundred students. Nearly all of the members of the faculty know nearly all the students and we depend a good deal on this personal knowledge in making our selections.

I may illustrate that by giving you the case of a man who applied in June to read for honors in social science. The committee rejected him because his work had lain so much in the field of natural science that they did not think he had the proper basis on which to read for honors in the social sciences. He appealed to me over the heads of the committee. In the course of our conversation he made this offer: "Let the committee say what books I ought to have read, what I ought to know; let them prescribe their list of books. I will read them this summer and pass any examination they want me to in the fall." I advised the committee to give him that chance, which they did. They were not so sanguine as I was, but they gave him a list of books and set him an examination on them. He passed creditably, he is now reading for honors and he is, I think, likely to be successful. That is the type we want for this kind of work—the man who is not afraid to tackle things, particularly the man who has independence, initiative and definite interests.

For my own part I do not want the whole student body reading for honors. I should not consider it wise to set up a special honors college. I have always questioned whether those colleges in Oxford that admit only honor students have, after all, pursued the best plan, because no matter how good your students are, some of them are better than others. Furthermore, when you set a man to honors work you set him definitely on an intellectual career. In my opinion every college should have a wide variety of types of men and of types of interest. There would be more sanity and breadth in the student body which is partly composed of men who are going into business or executive

careers than in one where all the students look forward to a lifetime of study.

I said that we wanted students in honors courses whose interests were definite, but we do not confine our honors work in any case to the limits of a single subject. We have adopted the principle that no honors courses shall be as narrow as a single American department. Instead of that, we have combined economics, political science, history, and one or two other subjects into an honors course in the Social Sciences, and in the same way we are putting into the honors course in English literature a historical and philosophical element, treating English literature on somewhat the same plan that the Greek and Latin literatures are treated in *Literae Humaniores* at Oxford.

We have set up only these two honors courses, Social Sciences and English Literature, this year. We hope to start similar work next year in the natural sciences and in modern languages. We are going slowly and shall not have such work organized in all our divisions until perhaps two years hence.

We give to our honors students, at the beginning of their Junior year, when they begin their honors work, an outline of what is expected of them. Our honors work is organized on the basis not of what students shall *do*, but of what, two years from date they will be expected to *know*. We don't care particularly how they find it out or when they find it out, all we care for is that they should know it. Accordingly, they have an outline of the field they should cover, the particular topics they should be prepared to discuss and the particular books, if there are any, on which they will be examined. At the end of these two years they will be examined over this field and we have warned them that their examination will be far more difficult than we should dare to give to ordinary under-graduates in ordinary courses.

The fine art of examining is one of the things that we are going to learn in this country in the development of

honors work. We expect for our honors examinations at Swarthmore to set from ten to twelve three-hour papers, on the various aspects of this work which the student has been expected to cover. Then after the examiners have read the papers they will summon the students before them for an oral examination which will give the examiners a chance to confirm the opinions they have drawn from the written papers. This examining will be done not by the professors who had been teaching the students but by men imported from the outside. We intend to import examiners and to say to them, "This is what these students have been supposed to prepare themselves on. This is what they are supposed to know. Now, will you be so kind as to examine them and find out whether they do know it and how well they know it and tell us how we should rate them?"

The members of the Swarthmore faculty, when I proposed that idea to them, said, "We realize that that means that we are going to be examined as well as the students." I thought of that when President Ferry said no information had yet been available as to faculty scholarship. I think this will be one way of finding out about faculty scholarship and faculty teaching power as well. A professor who is a good sportsman welcomes that kind of test. It gives some kind of objective measure of a man's skill in teaching. In any given instance, of course, the ability and energy of the student constitute the most important elements in the result. But in the aggregate these will be more or less constant and such examinations will form the nearest approach to an objective test of a man's power and stimulus as a teacher that one can find.

We do not expect to cover all the ground that is prescribed for these honors examinations in classes and lectures. In fact we are going to be very particular that some of it is not thus covered, that some very important part of it will be entirely the result of the student's own work. Meanwhile, giving the student this statement of require-



ments we do not hold him to any other requirements. We excuse him from all attendance on classes except insofar as he may want to attend. We excuse him from all examinations pending the finals at the end. At the end of the semester, the honor students may pack their bags and go home when examination week begins. We simply leave it to them to do this work in the way that they wish, and that is one reason why we make it one of our requirements for admitting students to this status, that they should be steady, sensible persons who will have the cleverness and independence to work things out for themselves, to be capable of independent work and, of course, who will develop that power of independent work as they go along.

We allow them to go to classes, naturally, if they want to. I myself do not believe that we ought to set up any large number of classes especially for honor students. That may be necessary in some particular cases but I don't believe it will be very frequently. There is enough lecturing going on in all colleges already, and our plan is to let them make such use of the educational facilities of the college as they or their tutors may think advisable, and for the rest to leave them to work out their own salvation.

The one exercise which they are expected to follow carefully is the individual instruction provided for honors students. We have not left the tutoring of these honor students to instructors. We have put in charge the best people we have in the divisions in which they are studying. We have not set up a tutorial system on the model of Oxford and Cambridge. For my own part I do not feel that to be advisable in the United States. The difficulty is the American departmental system. There are very few members of our faculties who are competent to direct students in as broad a field as that covered by one of our honors courses. We shall have men capable of doing that eventually—perhaps very soon. But we must first overcome the inhibitions of the departmental tradition.

Instead of setting up a tutorial system, we adopted a plan suggested to me last year by one of the professors at the University of Nebraska in the course of a discussion at Lincoln on this subject. It was suggested that under American conditions the seminar would work better and more economically than the English tutorial hour. American professors know how to run seminars. The seminars have the additional advantage that in them students learn from one another and that it is possible for several professors to attend so that they educate the faculty at the same time.

That system may not be permanent, but during the transition period it is a wonderful thing to have a half dozen students and three or four professors sit down together once a week to read and discuss the papers which the students have written. I find these discussions are with us very animated and interesting, apparently to everybody. They are scheduled for two hours a week in the afternoon and I am told they often run to three hours and may even be continued in the evening. The man in charge of an honors course theoretically divides up the entire ground to be covered into say four equal parts for the four semesters. Then he divides it somewhat roughly into weekly parts or topics which he asks the students to work up. They write papers on various phases of this topic, covering the work they have done for the week. They read these papers at the seminar; they discuss each other's papers and the reading they have done, and they get as well such individual help, such encouragement or restraint, as they may need from their professors. It is sometimes necessary to restrain them from going into too many classes; it is sometimes necessary to help them and encourage them in various ways, and this offers a convenient opportunity for that work. All the time we emphasize that our instruction is merely stimulus and help to them, that they are responsible for their own salvation. As I said before, this work of ours is experimental. We shall know something about the results in June and a little more perhaps a year from June.

## II

I want to add just one more word. Dr. Kandel has said that this movement is going to be criticized. I, for my own part, do not fear so much from the conservatism of colleges in the matter of honors courses, as I do from a stampede in the other direction so rapid that people will set up ill-considered attempts which are not carefully enough planned. Such work brings up many unexpected problems and should not be undertaken until all the problems which can be foreseen have been carefully worked out.

One objection that is made is that honors work is not democratic, that it means setting up some kind of special treatment or class privilege for the few, giving them something that is not given to the whole body of students. I think that an easy objection to answer. If democracy means equality we might as well stop trying to have democracy because we haven't got equality. We have never had it; in my opinion we never shall have it; and if we could I should be very sorry to be here when it arrived. If every man has an opportunity in an educational institution to do his level best, it seems to me that this plan is more democratic than the plan on which we are going at present. The great danger of democracy is mediocrity, and the only way in which you can get around that is by stimulating each man to do his best. Persistent mediocrity would, in the end, be fatal to democracy. No form of government which tended to level all abilities to a mediocre standard could survive permanently in competition with other forms of government which encourage expert ability. Democracy, like every other form of government, needs expert and highly trained servants, and it seems to us at Swarthmore that in such an honors course, as we are setting up we are training a few of these efficient servants of democracy.

**REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SABBATIC  
LEAVE**

DEAN OTIS E. RANDALL

The Association will remember that we made our report a year ago on the basis of the answers to a questionnaire which was sent out to the colleges and to the undergraduate and graduate schools of arts and sciences in the universities of the United States. As the questionnaire was late in going out, and as a number of the colleges were dilatory in making their replies, we were unable to make as thorough a study of our material as we desired. Since that time we have corresponded with other organizations which have been working on our problems, and through their willing co-operation have been able to secure valuable information confirming many of the results of our own investigation. A number of personal letters in addition to answers to our questionnaire have been received from college presidents, expressing frankly their views concerning prevailing practice or concerning practice which might be more nearly ideal if it could be instituted. We have also had time to retabulate the returns to our questionnaire and to make a more careful study of the many varying opinions expressed by college authorities in different parts of the country and under widely differing conditions.

Your Commission proposes at this time to present to you as concisely as possible such new information as we have been able to secure during the year through correspondence, together with a new and much more thorough tabulation of the replies to our questionnaire revealing present practice and desired practice in the various colleges, grouping them according to their location, their size and character, etc. Finally, on the basis of this material we shall try to draw a number of conclusions, and, if thought best by the Association, make a number of recommendations.

Professor Joseph Jastrow of the University of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Commission on Sabbatical Systems,

appointed by the American Association of University Professors, has expressed his great interest in the work which we are doing and a desire to co-operate with us. Owing to his serious illness, he has not been able to accomplish as much as he had hoped to by this time. He has made valuable comment and made excellent suggestions in connection with our work and our report. Professor Jastrow's committee will not in all probability report on their work until after our report to the Association is made.

Albert L. Barrows, Secretary of the Division of Educational Relations of the National Research Council, has furnished us with the results of his investigation made in the fall of 1919, when a questionnaire dealing with sabbatic leave was sent out to the colleges and universities of the United States. This material is a little old, but it is interesting and helpful, since it substantiates many of the conclusions which your Commission have drawn from their own investigation. Mr. Barrows reports that his questionnaire was sent out to 580 colleges and universities, and that 313 of these institutions made reply. The report reads as follows:

"It seems to be generally recognized that sabbatical leave is a legitimate expectation on the part of the college teaching profession, but much regret is expressed that resources do not permit its wider application.

"There is apparently a practice in some cases to grant sabbatical leave on a varying basis in the same institution, the decision being made variously according to seniority, reputation for research ability, etc.

"Some doubt is occasionally implied of the value of the use which faculty members may make of leave if granted, in that leave is frequently offered expressly on the provision that it be used for advanced study or for research, especially if part salary is to be continued during the leave.

"Most institutions exclude instructors, i.e., the lowest faculty grade, from privileges of this leave, or at least from leave with part pay.

"The prevailing standard for granting sabbatical leave,



proportionate to the present resources of most institutions, seems to be one year of absence after six or seven years of service, with salary continued at half pay. Many institutions modify this to the extent of granting a half year of absence on full pay after six years of service. Others permit a half year of absence after three years of service with a proportionate salary adjustment. Members of agricultural experiment stations are rarely included among those entitled to sabbatical leave.

"The total number of faculty members absent on leave during 1919-20 among the 102 institutions which recognize some form of leave system was 171. This was about 4 per cent of the total teaching force of these institutions.

"The general brevity of the answers to the questions concerning sabbatical leave and interpretative phrases in certain cases lead to the belief that in many institutions which report 'no system of sabbatical leave' in effect, such leave would be granted in worthy cases upon individual application.

"A prevailing basis for leave is for one year at half pay. There are a few institutions in which we know that upon request this basis may be varied to amount to one semester of leave at full pay instead of one year of leave on half pay.

"We have no definite information as to whether sabbatical leave is granted as a matter of right at the end of the stated term of service; but our impression is that applications for leave are generally more favorably acted upon if the applicant intends to use his time for study or research. Two or three institutions limit the number of faculty members who may be absent during a given year on sabbatical leave, thus indicating that for these institutions, at least, sabbatical leave is not a regularly earned right, but a privilege granted when consistent with the needs of the institution.

"Among our replies only two institutions mention the condition that an applicant for sabbatical leave agree to return to the institution at the expiration of his leave. In one of these cases the understanding is that a man going on leave will return for a period of three years and, in the other case, that he will return for a period of one year. We believe that, generally, there is no

obligation specified, requiring return to the institution.

"Our understanding is that the privilege of sabbatical leave is not taken advantage of nearly as much as it should be. The inhibiting condition seems to be that faculty members cannot afford to go upon a half pay status when their full salary even is barely sufficient to meet normal needs. At present the half pay basis seems to be the usual one for granting sabbatical leave."

Dean S. W. Beyer of Iowa State College furnishes us with a report made some time ago to the Board of Deans on the basis of returns from correspondence with a selected list of colleges and universities. Dean Beyer summarizes the principles which appear to be recognized in granting sabbatic leave as follows:

"1. Members of the instructional staff through a term of years of faithful and successful teaching acquire an equity. Sabbatical leave with pay is granted *in course* to discharge the equity.

"2. Members of the staff giving promise of greater usefulness to their college or university, if accorded better facilities for research, advanced study or professional experience are granted leaves of absence.

"3. Following the University of Chicago plan, staff members by teaching more than three quarters or two semesters may through teaching a fourth quarter, a third semester or summer session accumulate vacation time on pay.

"4. A few institutions grant leaves of absence permitting the absentee to furnish satisfactory substitute without expense to the institution."

The following recommendations were submitted to the Board of Deans and tentatively approved:

"Whenever any professor, associate professor or assistant professor has served continuously the college or university in one or more such grades at least six years, he may, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, have leave of absence for not more than one year on half pay under the following limitations and conditions:

"1. Application for such absence must be made through

the President of the college or the university, carry the endorsement of the head of the department, dean of his division, school or college, and be filed six months prior to the term during which absence is desired.

"2. As a general rule, not more than one absence from any department of instruction will be granted in any one year, and where more than one application from any department is made, precedence will be given in the order of seniority of service.

"3. Leaves of absence with pay will be granted only when the dean of his division, school, or college, and the president of the institution are assured that the candidate will use such leave for research work, advanced study or for the gaining of professional experience along lines which will be of distinct service to the college or university.

"4. The whole number of leaves of absence granted in any one year must not in the judgment of the president of the college or university and the Board of Education be excessive.

"5. Members of the experiment station staffs shall be accorded the same privileges as are extended to the members of the instructional staff."

President Judson of the University of Chicago writes:

"The University has no statute providing for sabbatic leave. We always have a number of members of the faculty who are absent on full pay. They have earned this by excess work. We do not in that case, of course, feel warranted in raising any questions as to what the Faculty do in the time in question. As a matter of fact, in most cases they use it to a large extent in pursuance of their scientific work."

The University publishes the following statement concerning "Work and Vacation Credit of Members of the Faculties." Each resident member of a faculty gives instruction thirty-six weeks of the year, ten hours a week or its equivalent. Members of faculties of a rank below that of Associate Professor, at the discretion of the President, for two

quarters within a year, may be required to give instruction fifteen hours or the equivalent. The member of a faculty takes his vacation in any one of the four quarters, according as it may be arranged, or he may take two vacations of six weeks each at different periods of the year. For every quarter or term in a year he may teach, in addition to the number of hours required, he receives, according as it may be arranged by the President, either an extra full pro-rata vacation or an extra two-thirds pro-rata salary, payable monthly during such vacation period. In case of resignation vacation credit thus earned is paid on the basis of two-thirds pro-rata salary.

"With reference to vacation credit the following limitations are to be observed:

"1. No obligation against the University for extra vacation credit shall be created except by vote of the Board of Trustees, on recommendation of the president, in each individual case.

"2. As a rule no member of the faculty may acquire at a given time more than nine months' extra vacation credit.

"3. No member of the faculty lower in rank than an associate shall be entitled to obtain extra vacation credit."

Harvard University publishes the following rules governing sabbatic leave:

"*Voted*, That the President and Fellows are disposed to grant occasional leave of absence for one year on half pay to professors and assistant professors, under the following rules:—

"1. That no professor or assistant professor have leave of absence on half pay oftener than once in seven years, unless by way of exception.

"2. That the whole number of applications for leave of absence in any one year be not, in the judgment of the President and Fellows, excessive.

"3. That the applications for the same year be properly distributed among the different departments.

"4. That the object of the professor or assistant profes-

sor in asking leave of absence be health, rest, study, or the prosecution of original work in literature or science."

President Sills of Bowdoin College writes as follows:

"In several of my reports as President I have referred to the necessity of being liberal with sabbatical absences. Personally I should like to see the sabbatical once in every seven years made compulsory and the professor given full pay, with the understanding that he should study or engage in research work, and that he should be responsible to the college or university during his absence. I am not in favor of sabbaticals more frequently than every seven years, for I think continuity of instruction is important. At present at Bowdoin, we give half pay when a professor is absent for the full year; full pay when he is absent a half year; and there is a further provision that no more than two men shall be absent on leave at the same time. This scheme works pretty well; but I should like to see it improved. I am very much interested in this whole matter, because I think the granting of sabbatical leave is about as good an investment as a college can make."

President Meiklejohn of Amherst writes:

"The rule which is now before the trustees for consideration is as follows: 'Each full professor shall be entitled, on application, to absence on leave with full salary in proportion of one year of absence for six years of service as full professor or associate professor. It is understood that while taking such leave the professor is in the service of the college and that his plans for the year shall be approved by the Trustees acting through the President of the college. It is further understood that such leaves may not be granted if the absence of the teacher would cause too great interference with the work of the college. In this case it is understood that as soon as possible the necessary adjustments will be made so that the absence may be allowed.'

"You will see that it rests on the principle that while on sabbatic leave a man is in the service of the college in exactly the same sense as when he is in town. Just what



that sense is one finds it fairly hard to state and perhaps it is not worth while to try. On one point I am quite clear, namely, that a man has no right to use sabbatic leave for the purpose of earning extra money. It seems to me clear that the arrangement should always be made that in case money is earned in ways which would not be available if the man were in residence, that amount should be subtracted from the amount of full salary paid by the college.

"I am very much in earnest about this issue in general because it seems clear that the sabbatic leave provision is not working. I am sure that in most of our colleges it is essential that it should work; that the men should go away and should have the expectation of going away."

The rules of Williams College read:

"Professors, and Assistant Professors, shall be entitled once in each seven years to a leave of absence for one year. Upon application and by special vote of the Trustees, any such year of leave may be subdivided or postponed.

"During every such year of his leave the Professor shall be entitled to receive full salary and during every such year of his leave the Assistant Professor one-half of the salary which for such year would be payable to him if on duty.

"During the absence of any officer of instruction, his duties shall be performed by a substitute, to be designated by the Trustees, or, in case of emergency, by the Committee on Instruction or the President, upon terms to be approved by the Trustees."

Provost Collins, of Middlebury College writes:

"A new practice, which was made possible by a special bequest of \$100,000 has been inaugurated at Middlebury. The income from this fund may be used (a) both for furloughs of members of the Faculty who have served not less than seven years continuously and (b) for the relief of any member of the Faculty in sickness or other exigency. In the administration of this fund, the President, the Treasurer, and a member of the Faculty selected by that body, determine the candidates. The only difficulty with this plan

is that the fund is insufficient to allow everyone to be benefitted by it in turn. Up to the present time, two members of the Faculty each year have enjoyed its privileges, but you can readily see that as increases are made in salaries of professors and as the number of members on the Faculty increases also, the benefits of the fund will be proportionately reduced."

Brown University has recently adopted the following:

"1. Every member of the Faculty who has spent six consecutive years in the service of Brown University with professorial rank may apply to the Corporation for the privilege of spending the whole or a part of the seventh year on sabbatic leave, during which leave he shall continue as a member of the Faculty, but be relieved of all University duties except as may be specially arranged.

"2. The opportunity of taking sabbatic leave is not guaranteed by the University, and shall be granted only when the condition of the department involved and of the University in general is such that the professor's absence will not cause serious impairment to the University.

"3. Sabbatic leave may involve absence for an entire year, during which period the professor shall receive one-half his regular salary; or it may involve absence for one half year under full salary, provided arrangements are made, satisfactory to the Advisory and Executive Committee whereby such absence does not involve the University in additional expense.

"4. The purpose of the sabbatic leave is not personal enjoyment or profit, but increase of equipment for the service of the University. It is understood, therefore, that a professor will not enter the service of any other organization or institution without specific vote of the Corporation.

"5. Applications must be made in writing and addressed to the President."

At the time we made our report a year ago we had no time to tabulate the replies to a number of questions on our questionnaire. We present here these questions and the replies:

1. What is the minimum time of service which an official must render in your institution before he is entitled to sabbatic leave? Forty-two institutions answer seven years; twenty-three institutions say six years; four institutions say five years; three institutions say three years; one institution says one year; one institution says ten years; six institutions say each case is decided on its own merits; thirty-nine institutions report no rule.

2. What proportion of your faculty avail themselves of this privilege yearly? The replies to this question are not of sufficient importance to warrant tabulation.

3. If the proportion of your faculty who avail themselves of the privilege of sabbatic leave is small, will you give the reasons for it? Twenty-six institutions reply, lack of university funds; nine reply, small faculty; four reply, domestic needs; four reply, small compensation while absent; four report little encouragement to go; one reports privilege open only to senior professors in each department. A large number make no reply.

4. What restrictions or directions are made concerning the use which the member of the faculty shall make of his time? Fifteen institutions reply, study, travel, or writing; twelve reply, professional self-development; nine reply, use of the year in a way which will increase the officer's value to the institution; two reply, shall not enter the employ of another institution; one replies, strictly for advanced degree; thirty institutions reply, no restrictions; two hundred and six make no answer.

5. Have you any suggestions or information to offer concerning any phase of the problem before us? Outside the valuable suggestions contained in a limited number of personal letters, there were very few replies to this question.

The answers to the first question on our questionnaire indicated that fifty-nine institutions made provision for sabbatic leave as an official policy, while sixty-four adopted the practice only in special cases. We have made a comparative study of these two groups of institutions, which we

refer to as groups A and B. We note that 62 per cent of group A are privately endowed, while 38 per cent are tax supported. We also note that the institutions making up the two groups are located largely in states of recognized educational excellence. The larger portion of the institutions in group A are approved institutions of the Association of American Universities, while group B has a number of institutions which are not on this list but are on the American Council on Education list of institutions certified as preparing students for postgraduate study abroad.

It is noticed in connection with each of these questions that there are a surprisingly large number of institutions making no reply. The members of the Commission are uncertain as to the reason for this. Does it indicate that there were no answers to be made, or does the absence of the answer indicate a negative tendency?

A study of the replies from seventy-two institutions not granting sabbatic leave at the present time but expressing the desire to institute the practice as soon as possible led to no significant results.

A table has been prepared showing the correlation between salary paid, salary desired to be paid, restrictions as to use of time, use of sabbatic leave, and pensions, but the results are too cumbersome to incorporate in our report.

The study of our problem has given rise to a number of interesting questions which we are unable to answer from the material in hand, and which might have some bearing on our conclusions.

1. How many years of experience in granting sabbatic leave have the institutions in group A and B had? How many members of the faculty in each case have availed themselves of the privilege during these years? How many members are on sabbatic leave this present year?

2. How much weight in an institution has the practice of granting sabbatic leave under generous conditions in attracting desirable professors? How does it compare with

other perquisites which are offered, such as house, vacations, pensions, etc.?

3. How do the disadvantages of the students due to the professor's absence compare with the advantages gained by the professor?

4. What is the history of the work accomplished by professors on leave? Have these accomplishments been worth the sacrifice of the time and money involved?

Apparently our continued study of the answers to the questionnaire and the replies to our letters of inquiry sent out to a number of sources of information tend to substantiate the statements which we made and the conclusions which we drew in our report last January.

Your Commission would like, therefore, to present to the Association for consideration and possible adoption the following conclusions or recommendations as expressing the opinion of the Association concerning the question of sabbatic leave:

1. That every institution so far as its resources may permit should make some sort of provision by which members of the teaching force may be relieved of their duties at stated intervals and given an opportunity to make a change in academic climate, and through travel, study, or investigation to equip themselves for better service to the institution.

2. That both the college and the professor should look upon the plan of sabbatic leave, whatever its nature, as made primarily in the interests of the college, even though the professor is the first to receive the benefits, in the same sense that the most progressive business organizations frequently send their most trusted employees away on extensive trips with expenses fully paid in order that these employees may become acquainted with conditions outside their own organization, and thereby become better equipped for service at home. Under these conditions the professor will not look upon his granted leave of absence as a gift or as a favor, but as a contract in which he is under obligation to make good use of his time and to make proper returns to the college.



3. That college authorities should retain the right to determine the number of absentees which should be allowed in any one year, for no institution can afford to undertake the work of educating young men and women today with a teaching force in any way inadequate for the task.

4. That the college authorities should make sufficiently generous provision for the professor's needs during his absence to make it possible for him to get away, for unless this is done only a very small proportion of the faculty will be able to enjoy such privileges. The majority of our professors can do little better than meet their yearly expenses with full salary, and it must not be forgotten, too, that travelling expenses are heavier than home expenses.

5. That in case a professor's health has been impaired by long and strenuous service to the college, the college should grant him leave of absence with generous remuneration in order that he may, if possible, recover his health and return to his post. Recognition of past service and the hope of service in the future should alone constitute sufficient grounds for such action.

6. That in case a member of the faculty is absent on leave and is at the same time receiving remuneration from the college, he should not only make it a point to use his time profitably but he should also make it a point to return to the institution in whose employ he still remains and make proper returns in the way of service, or in case the institution shall see fit to release him he should make proper financial returns to the authorities.

7. That college authorities shall have the right as a rule to regard it a violation of trust and a misuse of the opportunities of sabbatic leave when a member of the faculty on sabbatic leave spends the time upon work which is intended primarily for personal remuneration, particularly if he is at the same time receiving a salary from the college.

8. That in case a member of the faculty has acquired sufficient reputation to secure a call to serve as an exchange professor, the time which he takes for the performance of

this work should not as a rule interfere with his right to sabbatic leave in regular course.

9. That in case a member of the faculty for any reason is unable to accept the privilege of sabbatic leave at the expiration of seven years of service, he should be entitled to the privilege at any subsequent period, but under no more generous considerations as the years accumulate than are normally provided.

10. That whenever the resources of the institution permit, the college authorities should make it possible for each member of the faculty of professorial rank to be absent every seventh year and for the whole year without any reduction in pay, or to be absent every fourth year for one half of the year and without reduction in salary. In this case a professor would have once in every four years approximately eight months at his disposal, and would not, during his tenure of office, be absent from his post any longer than he would be were he given a full year of absence every seventh year. Furthermore, an absence of fifteen months from college duties, which is possible when a professor is absent for a whole year, is as a rule more time than he needs in one continuous period. This has been indicated by the use which some of those on long leave of absence have made of their time. Frequently professors on a year's leave of absence remain at home or about the college for several months before taking full advantage of the opportunities open to them. Quite as frequently professors on leave of absence for a full year return home several months before their vacation is over.

11. That in case the institution finds it impracticable to adopt the plan just outlined, provision be made for the absence of each member of the faculty of professorial rank every seventh year for a half year and without reduction in pay. This plan makes it possible for a professor to leave his post for seven to eight months, from June to February, or February to September, without reduction in his income.

12. That some provision should be made for the bene-

fit of exceptionally promising men on the faculty below professorial rank, which should make it possible for them to drop their work for a year in order to pursue their studies elsewhere and to fit themselves for better service to the institution later.

---

### ATHLETIC CONDITIONS IN SOUTHERN COLLEGES

DEAN DOUGLAS ANDERSON

Abstracts of a Report presented at the 1922 Annual Meeting of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. The entire Report is published in the Proceedings of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

For the past twenty-seven years there have been in active operation in the Southern States two organizations, each of which in its own way has done valiant service for the elevation of standards and for the development of a spirit of co-operation among the colleges and universities of that section. One of these, the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association, while organized, as stated in its constitution, primarily for "the development, regulation and purification of college athletics throughout the South," has yet had a quite decided, though indirect, influence upon the elevation of standards of scholarship. The second of these organizations, "The Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States," has, until the last year, devoted its attention almost entirely to the question of standards of scholarship, entrance requirements, and such like matters, paying only slight attention to the question of intercollegiate athletics. Under present conditions, however, there is no phase of college administration which presents such serious problems, nor one which is attracting so much attention from the general public. Large universities with ample resources are building bowls, stadia, coliseums,

etc., and spending annually enormous sums of money, principally for the purpose of showing the general public the amazing prowess of their respective foot-ball teams; smaller institutions are making frantic efforts to keep up with the race, with the result that the money spent on one season of football is often much greater than several years' appropriations for library and laboratories. Many of these institutions pay salaries to their football coaches greater than those paid to their presidents and several times greater than the highest salaries paid to professors. Cities and towns having no collegiate institutions within their borders are building great playing fields and offering all kinds of inducements to colleges to stage thereon their annual foot-ball contests. These and many other considerations have convinced the members of the Southern Association that the time has come for it to take more definite official cognizance of conditions in athletics in the institutions composing its membership and in such other institutions as may in the future desire to become members. Upon the recommendation, therefore, of its Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning, the Association at its annual meeting in December, 1921, passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That the President of the Association before laying down his office for the year now closing shall appoint a committee of five to inquire into the conditions and administration of athletics in the colleges that are members of this Association, with full authority and instruction to investigate entrance credits of athletes, records of athletes in college, past athletic records of athletes, number of days' absence from college during athletic season, salary of coach or coaches and by whom paid, and such other matters as pertain to the purity and wholesomeness of the administration of athletics.

Chancellor Kirkland, the retiring President, appointed on this Committee Professor Douglas Anderson of Tulane University, Professor N. W. Dougherty of the University of Tennessee, Professor Robert T. Hinton of Georgetown

College, Kentucky; Professor A. H. Patterson of the University of North Carolina, and Mr. J. Carter Walker, of the Woodberry Forest School, Virginia.

A questionnaire was formulated and sent to about seventy-five (75) colleges and universities of the South. The specific questions therein were grouped under the general heading of Athletic Control, Financial, Coaching System, Entrance Requirements, College Standing, Eligibility, Absences, Betting, Summer Baseball and General.

The study of the answers to the questionnaire indicates in a general way:—

1. The need and desire for more effective faculty control extending to all phases of the question of inter-collegiate athletics.
2. That the excessive expenditures for intercollegiate sports, particularly football, tend to give the student, as well as the general public, a false estimate of values in the sphere of college activities.
3. That salaries of coaches, especially those of seasonal coaches, are too high in comparison with those of professors.
4. That there is need for more rigorous enforcement of entrance requirements and for the elimination of the so-called "special student" from participation in intercollegiate sports.
5. That there should be vigorous and active co-operation between the colleges on the one hand and the primary schools, on the other, to eradicate the pernicious habit of "scouting" for athletes in the preparatory schools.
6. That the scheduling of intersectional games necessitating long trips away from home should be discouraged; and that athletic contests should be held on the home grounds of one or the other of the contestants.
7. That betting and gambling, particularly on football games, are increasing to the extent that the professional gambler is beginning to turn his attention toward this field. Every possible effort should be made to prevent betting upon the grounds of the institution.



8. The needs for more effective encouragement and development of intramural sports or mass athletics. Too many students now limit their participation in athletics to the role of simple spectators.

Almost universally throughout the replies to these general questions runs the expression of a desire for more effective faculty control. Back of this is the feeling that too often the participation of the alumni and the "friends" of the institution in the control of athletics presents one of the gravest problems. Loyalty to *alma mater* and to her best traditions on the part of her alumni is the finest asset any college or university can have, and sorry, indeed, would be the state of an institution which did not possess it, but among members of the faculties and other college officials who have to do with the administration of intercollegiate athletics there is the conviction that too often this alumni and "outside" influence in the control of athletics constitutes one of the strongest contributing factors to the introduction and perpetuation of the abuses which we so greatly deplore. "Scouting" is one of the most pernicious of such activities and one of the most difficult to detect or control. If one tries to reason concerning these evils with the alumnus, who believes the great objective of his college in athletics is the production of a winning team, his answer is usually to the effect that—"Everybody is doing it, why not we?" If the colleges and universities of this country permit this old sophistry to prevail, will they not be laying themselves open to scorn of all right-thinking people and to the accusation of being untrue to the ideals of their founders and to their own best traditions?

While it is our belief that the solution of the problem of intercollegiate athletics is a matter almost entirely of the conscience of the individual institution, still much good has been accomplished and may still be accomplished through co-operative effort. It is a most hopeful sign when the Southern Association with its fine traditions, and its record of accomplishment in raising the standards of colleges and

secondary schools in the South, decides to take greater official cognizance of this problem.

This Committee would recommend that your Standard No. 16 which refers to Athletics be made somewhat more specific with regard to the following points:—

1. Faculty control to the extent that final decision in all matters of athletic policy shall rest absolutely and unequivocally with the faculty.
2. Rigorous enforcement of entrance requirements and scholarship standards without discrimination in favor of or against the athlete.
3. Elimination of the "special" student from participation in intercollegiate contests.
4. Abolition of the seasonal in favor of the full-time coach, who shall rank as a member of the faculty.
5. Summary dismissal of a coach who lends himself in any way to the practice of "scouting" and who offers high school students inducements to attend his particular college.
6. Reduction of annual expenditures for intercollegiate athletics to amounts commensurate with other departments of the college.
7. Regulation of the amount of time devoted to athletics by limitation of the number of games in each season and by scheduling practice periods.

It is interesting to note that a new problem is now rapidly developing out of an attempt to correct an old abuse. The rule that Freshmen may not play on 'varsity teams has been adopted by practically all the athletic conferences throughout the country. Yet in many instances, Freshmen teams have been organized, they are coached to almost the same extent as the 'varsity teams, they have extensive schedules made up for them, many of the games taking them away from their own institutions, and the newspapers are according them increasing publicity in their sporting columns. If this is to continue we shall soon see a condition of affairs in which all the good effects, which it was hoped would result from this rule, will be entirely nullified.

In conclusion, attention should be directed to the fact that while the answers to the questionnaire have furnished a considerable mass of statistics concerning the conduct of athletics in the South, the Committee has attempted in its study of these to avoid a more formal and statistical report, but rather to have its suggestions and recommendations become an expression of the spirit in which the solution of the many problems of intercollegiate athletics should be undertaken. It will be a source of gratification to our Committee if any portion of this report may be of service to you, for the fundamental problems are the same wherever they may arise, North, South, East or West, and in our opinion the fundamental solution, as far as it may be expressed in a single statement, is—more conscientious, more positive and more effective faculty control.

---

## FACULTY CONTROL OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

DEAN FRANK W. NICOLSON

If the following remarks appear dogmatic, as they probably will, let me ask you not to take them as based upon the authority of the speaker, who claims only such knowledge of collegiate athletics as may come from an experience of twenty years as chairman of the faculty committee on athletics of a small college, but rather as having behind them the authority of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, an organization of two hundred or more of the important colleges and universities of the country. An attendance at all its meetings during the seventeen years since it was organized, and an intimate knowledge of its affairs derived from membership during all but one year on its executive committee, give the speaker confidence in presenting the ideals and policies of the Association.

I have been asked to speak on professionalism as the

outstanding evil of intercollegiate athletics. If you permit, I will associate with it commercialism. In these two elements you may find the cause of most, if not all, of the disorders that prey upon the modern intercollegiate athletic world.. There is a common denominator to professionalism and commercialism, money. It is for money that the athlete surrenders his personality and becomes the paid servant of the promoter, aiming to win for the money there is in it, rather than to play for the fun there is in it, exchanging the sterling "sport for sport's sake" for the tawdry "sport for the pocket's sake". And as in professionalism, so in athletic commercialism in colleges, money is the underlying curse—money for stadiums, money for highly paid coaches, money for long and expensive trips, money for pampering the athletes, money, money, money!

"The love of money is the root of all evil," we are told. Possibly so, as regards an individual, but yet a somewhat exaggerated statement, and fairly to be coupled with the fact that the lack of money is the root of great unhappiness. But the love of money for colleges is not generally looked upon as the root of evil. Colleges are crying for money; who ever complains that a college is getting too much of it? How comes it, then, that money, a blessing to colleges, plays such an evil part in a single feature of college life—intercollegiate athletics? There is mismanagement somewhere.

How are college athletics managed? A statistical inquiry entitled "The Status of Physical Education in American Colleges", was published in 1921 by a Committee of the American Physical Education Association. Dr. G. L. Meylan, of Columbia, Chairman, shows that in about 250 colleges, including almost all that participate in intercollegiate athletics, the management of athletic affairs is in only 32 per cent of the cases in the hands of the faculty. In 30 per cent the faculty shares the government with undergraduates, and in 25 per cent with students and alumni. In 13 per cent the students themselves have control.

The aim of this paper is to show that only complete faculty control will cure the evils of intercollegiate athletics. Dividing the control with students is safe only when student participation is limited to serving as managers of the sports. all financial matters and the formulation of general policy remaining in the hands of a member or a committee of the faculty. A joint council in which the alumni have a part, while it served its purpose as a working policy for a good many years, is now being discarded because the alumni have insisted, by reasons of their financial contributions, on dictating the policy in certain matters, especially the vital one of the coaches to be employed. Administration by student athletic councils is the worst plan of all, if it means that the faculty pursues a "hands off" policy, and exercises no supervision or control.

If in the following remarks too great attention seems to be given to the 25 per cent of colleges in which alumni participation still persists, the attitude is to be ascribed to the fact that the speaker's own college, along with a number of other New England institutions, is at present wrestling with the problem of securing freedom from alumni dictation, and further to the conviction that most of our present evils in athletic matters have been due to the introduction of an alien element, the alumni, into the management of a branch of college affairs that belongs strictly to the faculty, and should never have been allowed to escape from their control.

Intercollegiate athletics in the United States began a half century ago with informal, impromptu games between neighboring institutions, when each contestant equipped himself and paid his own traveling expenses. Gate receipts were non-existent, or negligible; no trainers, no coaches,—a spontaneous and delightful afternoon of sport. Time passed, and the gatherings became more formal. Local patriotism was aroused and steps were taken to achieve victory for the "good old college". The active young alumni put their heads together and conceived measures to make



success more sure,—they saw to it that experts were engaged to teach the college boys the fine points of the game; they kept their eyes open for promising players, in school or out of school, and directed their steps in the right direction; they made it worth their while to go, and financially profitable to stay; they saw to it that the newspapers played up the game, and that the public in increasing numbers paid their good money to help along the cause. And the faculties, the governing boards of the institutions, to whom was committed the care of the youth of the colleges? What were they doing? They sat idly by lamenting the waste of time and energy in frivolous games, but—"Boys will be boys! It's none of our business what they do in their spare hours, and, thank Goodness, it keeps them out of mischief!" Such was the attitude, as I remember it, when I was an undergraduate a quarter century ago. Meantime, the alumni tightened their grip on the situation,—graduate coaches, graduate managers, graduates sitting in council with undergraduates and faculty and playing a disproportionate part because they provided the money for the coaches that they insisted should be appointed. Only recently have faculties begun to awaken to a knowledge that they have let the reins slip from their hands, and that they must seize them again if they are to avoid disaster. Faculty control is now the watchword, and it is sounding very loud in New England. In the West, through the strong conferences of colleges, faculty control has prevailed for years; but not all colleges belong to conferences—in the East, such bodies are non-existent as a governing force, and even in the West, to judge from several letters received from college presidents, faculty control has not yet been resumed in the smaller colleges, even if the large universities in the powerful conferences enforce it.

Why should the alumni have a controlling influence in any part of college affairs? Who but the faculty is competent to manage the details of a college? The trustees

concern themselves with large affairs,—being chiefly non-resident, they leave the management of the college to the president and the faculty—experts whom they have chosen for the purpose. And how can the alumni claim the intimate knowledge necessary to handle college matters? What is an alumnus, anyway? One who has spent at most four years in a college, during which time he manifested no desire, certainly no ability, to administer college policies. For that matter, the faculty are themselves alumni, generally of the very college in which they are teaching, and they have the advantage of years of residence and study of local problems which certainly fits them, if they are competent men (and if they are not, they would not be where they are) to plan for the best interests of the institution to which they are giving their lives. Most alumni visit their colleges once or twice a year, probably for the big football game. From the gossip they hear on the campus they form their ideas as to what must be done if the college is to be athletically saved.

If it were not so dangerous, the influence exerted by alumni in inter-collegiate athletics might be considered humorous. It is as illogical as it would be for the undergraduates to claim the right to shape the curriculum. Here we have a body of outsiders, graduates or non-graduates to be sure, but still outside the governing body of a college, demanding that the faculty entrust the teaching in an important department of education, the playing of games, to men appointed by themselves, putting pressure on the faculty to give an unreasonable allowance from college duties to athletics, complaining if a professor's marks exclude a star from the team, insisting that a certain group of students whom they select shall be set apart to give public exhibitions of their prowess for money, and that the money thus received, large sums in many cases, shall be expended, not for the upbuilding of the college but for the perpetuation of an unnatural system. Happily, we are coming to view intercollegiate games in a new light. They have their

faults, like the fraternity system, but both are so ingrained in the American college that it would be hard to get rid of them. Therefore they must be used to the best advantage. There is no objection to a limited number of intercollegiate contests, if properly controlled, and made part of the whole educational system. At least they provide a picturesque opportunity for the display of college enthusiasm and *esprit de corps*. But membership on the 'varsity team should be but the culmination of a system of physical training under college instructors. Intramural sports are making great strides these days, and almost every student receives theoretical and practical training in the playing of games. In the days of the S. A. T. C., army officers in command at the colleges demurred at giving time and attention to the playing of games,—the manual of arms, they said, gives all the exercises needed. But visit West Point today and you will find every cadet taught to play almost every game, and quite a large group of army officers are detailed to supervise these sports. So college boys, under college instructors, are trained in various games, partly for immediate mental and physical benefit, partly for the gain that will come to them in future years, when they can continue a rational system of exercise for themselves, and can instruct others how to play sensibly. Games are arranged between classes, between fraternities, between this and that group, and by a process of sifting, the best players in college are selected for the 'varsity. But now the alumni step in. "Such and such players", they say, "belong from now on to us. We will put them under our highly paid coach, and will use them to advertise the college." No! There should not be, there cannot much longer be, this divided authority. The faculty must control. All coaches should be members of the faculty, paid from the college treasury. All athletic finances should be handled by the college treasurer, or his agent. The making of schedules, the whole athletic policy of the college should be in the hands of the professor of physical education, associated, if desirable, with a com-

mittee of the faculty. Such is the growing practice among colleges, and such, undoubtedly, will be the program of the future.

The training of the body has recently, and more especially since the military draft showed more than a third of our American men from twenty-one to thirty-one years of age to be physically deficient, come to be recognized as quite as important as that of the mind. In a sense it is more so, not only for the physical upbuilding and defense of the nation, but also for the cause of learning itself,—for a highly trained mind in a sickly body cannot function to perfection and is destined to a shortened existence. The professional schools are now turning out yearly considerable numbers of men trained for scientific supervision of this work. Physical directors, many of them doctors of medicine, are coming to be recognized as members of a faculty with the standing, if not the title, of full professors. Under their direction should be placed all the teachers, trainers, and coaches of athletics, including those of the 'varsity teams, and all these officers should have a place on the faculty as assistants or instructors. We may have to pay them a little more than the average salary of their positions, for the life of an athletic coach, as a coach, is generally comparatively short. With a few notable exceptions, it is the young and vigorous man, not long graduated from college, who can best inspire confidence and instill enthusiasm in a 'varsity team. But the day of the exorbitantly paid seasonal coach is rapidly passing. A few of them, though possibly not college graduates themselves, have won a high place by force of character in college communities, but most of them have gone from one position to another, attracted by offers of higher pay, not staying long enough to absorb the spirit of the community, conscious that their success (which to most of them meant their salary) depended on the number of games won, and not always over-particular as to the means by which they won them.

The greatest care should be taken in appointing the professor of physical education. No member of the faculty has a greater influence over the college body. He should not be chosen because he is a great coach, rather because he knows enough about coaching and is such a good judge of human nature that he can pick out the right men to do the coaching under his direction. He should be himself a man of broad general education, as well as a trained expert—a graduate of a liberal college, and of a medical school,—one who is the intellectual equal of his colleagues. If he is appointed primarily for his coaching ability, and is permitted to coach himself, there is danger that the college will revert to the condition from which we are trying to save it, and that everything will be summed up in the word "victory." The physical education department has a higher function than merely to turn out 100 per cent victorious intercollegiate athletic teams.

To the professor of physical education, then, a member of the faculty in full standing, should be entrusted management of all the affairs of his department. It would be wise for him not to do any coaching himself, for a member of the faculty on permanent tenure should not be allowed to endanger his position by exposure to the fickle favor of a college community continually demanding victories. He should merely do his best to secure from time to time those assistants who may be expected to produce the best results with the material given them.

All the finances involved in both intramural and intercollegiate athletics should be administered by the college, and the salaries of all coaches should be paid from the college treasury.

It may be asked how faculty control will solve the problems of intercollegiate athletics, especially professionalism and commercialism.. As to professionalism, faculty administration will be more thorough and less prejudiced than that of alumni or students. Both of these classes are too



much inclined to put the telescope to the blind eye when investigating reported violations of the amateur rule among their own men, and too inclined, while searching for the mote in the rival's eye, to overlook the beam in their own. College professors are as fond of victory as anyone, but they have longer vision than the undergraduate or the young graduate. From their point of view there are other seasons and other years coming, while an undergraduate thinks that unless the championship is won this year the world might as well come to an end. Even the rigorous steps taken by the faculty will not altogether abolish professionalism. There will always be a few black sheep in the undergraduate body to whom a few dollars seem cheaply earned at the expense of a lie or two. But the faculty have a strong weapon, if they will only use it, in a campaign of education and an appeal to honor on the part of the students. To require athletes to sign affidavits as to their income, and to submit themselves to a legal cross-examination as to their activities seems a poor method to employ with college men. Rather we should strive to impress upon them the desirability of clean athletics and then leave it to the high-mindedness of the college body to enforce it. The honor system in examinations has shown itself a powerful force in the college community for improving moral standards. We have employed it at my own college for twenty years, and have this year rejoiced in an extension of its spirit in another direction, since the student body, by an almost unanimous vote, have taken over the enforcement of prohibition upon their own members, and have agreed to report every case of drinking to a student committee which is empowered to punish infraction of the law by severe penalties. It is only necessary to persuade college men that the amateur law is a necessary basis for college athletics and they may be trusted, under the guidance of the faculty, to see that it is enforced.

Commercialism will certainly disappear from college athletics when all monies received pass through the college

treasury and are employed in extending the educational facilities of the institution. Instead of being lavished on the 'varsity teams they will be utilized for the benefit of the whole student body. Mr. Fielding Yost told us at the convention of the N. C. A. A. last month how money was needed for the construction of a building at the University of Michigan for the development of intra-mural sports. None being available for the purpose, he went to the banks and showed the football receipts for the last season. Because of like prospects for the next few years, he was able to borrow all the money needed, and it will take only a few years of big football contests to repay it. The demand of the public for admission to big college games is increasing, and promises a stable source of revenue for the college. If the large colleges are to have great stadiums for their games, it is only fair that the public who enjoy the use of them should pay for their upkeep. And that such stadiums are necessary for the large colleges is seen from the fact that, with their thousands of living graduates, some place must be available for the accommodation of them and their friends. The building of similar stadiums in large cities as meeting places for visiting college teams should be discouraged, as savoring too much of hippodroming. Each college should play in its own back yard, or in its rival's. College sports are not intended for the amusement of the public but for the enjoyment of the college community.

Perhaps we may look forward to the day when intercollegiate athletics shall be endowed and the games made free to invited guests. This would certainly tend to dignify them and to place them on a proper footing with relation to other college activities. Until that time comes, the receipts may well be expended in developing to the full the program of "athletics for all," and enabling every undergraduate to share in their benefits.

Assuming the faculty to have complete control of athletics, making and enforcing proper rules without the ne-

cessity of conciliating alumni or depending on the support of undergraduates, what rules shall they make and enforce?

1. The scholarship rule. Membership on a 'varsity team, the honor of representing his college in contests with friendly rivals, cannot be claimed as a right by any student; it should be awarded as a prize. It should go only to those who are doing creditable work in their classes and justifying their admission to academic privileges. The days have long passed when appearance in a laboratory for a few hours a week qualified a so-called student to be dubbed a college athlete. All colleges now require some scholarship qualification, varying of course as the marking and recording system varies in different institutions. But it may fairly be assumed that a player on the team of a reputable college is maintaining himself with some degree of credit in his classes. A 'varsity player should be free of entrance conditions, his record of examinations passed should be such as to promote him from class to class, and his current work should be well up to or over the average. The two-sport rule should be enforced, limiting activity to two branches of sport, either as player or manager, in one year, and debarring from any two that are being pursued at the same period of the year. With athletics in this rule should be included the glee club, dramatics, the college paper, and the various other organizations that are clamoring for the outstanding man. This rule makes it necessary for a student to give at least one-third of the year to study, without distraction, and it is also valuable in that it tends to distribute undergraduate honors, instead of confining them to a few specially endowed individuals.

2. The amateur rule. Apart from the vexing summer ball problem, a strict amateur rule is being quite generally enforced. As to summer ball, it is beginning to appear that the colleges will never reach unanimous agreement pro or con. And so a compromise measure is being adopted lately by a number of institutions, permitting a student to play baseball in the summer, provided he obtains permission be-

forehand from the athletic authorities of his college, who are then able to look into all the circumstances of the case and follow his summer career closely. Fortunately baseball is the only sport that offers college youth a great temptation to forfeit his amateur standing. Recent attempts to introduce professional football have been so frowned upon, even by the National Association of Football Coaches, and participation in it has been so severely punished by some college authorities that it seems to lack any serious menace.

3. The Freshman rule. This might almost come first in the list, so important is it in reducing proselyting and fostering good scholarship. More than half the colleges now enforce it and the number is rapidly growing. It is a sound rule. It protects the college from the player who is induced by money gifts to enter primarily for athletic purposes, since few will endure a year of probation, involving hard and successful study, if their chief motive is to make the team, and it protects the genuine student, for it gives him a chance to get a good start in his studies so that he can afford later to take time off and give the necessary energy to the exacting demands of the athletic coaches. It was a difficult rule to introduce in the smaller colleges, and dismal prophecies were made as to its effect on next year's 'varsity. But statistics won the day, by showing that a large proportion of Freshman players dropped out of college before or at the end of the year, and it seemed only good business not to spend time and money in coaching temporary players. The universal experience has been, I believe, that better teams followed the introduction of the rule. At the last N. C. A. A. meeting it was reported that a college of only one or two hundred students received permission from the conference to which it belonged to play Freshmen on account of paucity of numbers, but two years later the same college requested to be enrolled in the list of those enforcing the rule, as their experience without it had not been satisfactory.

The rule is now becoming so general, and is in principle

so reasonable, that it is time that pressure was put on the institutions, not always very small ones, that have not adopted it, by leaving them off of schedules. They should not enjoy an unfair advantage over their opponents.

Care should be taken that adoption of the rule is not followed by the over-development of Freshmen teams and the introduction of a schedule of intercollegiate Freshman contests. By this plan, all the advantage gained would be thrown away. One, or at most two, such contests might be permitted, but not more. The Committee on Resolutions, at the last N. C. A. A. meeting, recommended that no such contests be allowed. This was thought too stringent, and the matter was referred to the Executive Committee for report; but the mere introduction of the resolution by a committee appointed to give careful consideration to matters of policy is significant.

4. The migrant rule. The tramp athlete has made himself such a nuisance that steps are being taken to bar him from polite society. Colleges have varied heretofore in the measures taken to keep him out; some have debarred from participation in intercollegiate athletics for a year one who comes from another college in which he has participated as a member of a 'varsity team; others have imposed the same restriction whether the newcomer has ever won a place on a 'varsity team or not. The rule that is now coming into force in some colleges and conferences debars from competition a man from another college, not for a year, but for the whole length of his course—a severe rule, certainly, but made necessary by unbearable conditions.

If a college faculty enforces these four rules, along with a few others that are generally accepted nowadays without question, such as not playing special students and graduate students, it will practically eliminate professionalism and its attendant evil, proselyting, and will do its share toward clearing up the athletic mess. And at the same time the faculty must be continually urging the moral side of the question, upholding clean amateur sport, and fighting the



gambling evil which of recent years shows signs of increasing.

In fine, and by way of summary, absolute faculty control is recommended for the following reasons:

1. The other methods of control that have been employed have not prevented certain evils, notably professionalism and commercialism.

2. Faculty control has been tried for years in certain colleges and universities and has worked successfully.

3. Faculty control tends to dignify college sports by placing them in their right relation to the other elements of a college education.

4. Faculty control provides a fair and competent tribunal for the settlement of intercollegiate disputes and the determination of questions of eligibility. It substitutes the "gentleman's agreement" for trial in the newspapers.

5. The department of physical education must be master within its own house. It cannot submit to alien dictation if it is to do the work which the college expects it to accomplish. A new and important department of college education must not be asked to work with its hands tied.

6. The faculty cannot evade responsibility for its students. Particularly in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, where so much money is involved, where the dangers, particularly of professionalism and commercialism, are so great, the word of the faculty should be law, and that word cannot be effectively spoken without absolute faculty control of intercollegiate athletics.

## INCREASE IN COLLEGE ENDOWMENTS

PRESIDENT CLARK W. CHAMBERLAIN

In the years immediately following 1914-15, American colleges faced the greatest crisis in their history. The cost of operation and maintenance ran higher and higher until within five years it had increased 75 per cent. Less than one-half the total budget of the average American College was available for teachers' salaries. The most heroic efforts made it possible to increase salaries only 25 per cent at a time when the cost of living, at a very conservative estimate had risen more than 80 per cent. Teachers have always borne more than their share of self-sacrifice. Their margin of safety before the war was small or did not exist at all. The percentage of increase in the cost of living was more than three times the percentage of increase in salary and good men were forced from the profession in alarming numbers. Vacancies were filled by colleges bidding against one another and the weaker colleges lost many of their experienced teachers only to find it necessary to pay inexperienced teachers a higher salary than then had been received by their experienced predecessors. From 1915 to 1920 American colleges lost on the average 35 per cent of their faculties. In the same period some colleges lost as high as 85 per cent of their teaching staff. After straining every resource two hundred and fifty-nine institutions with eight thousand five hundred and forty teachers could pay an average salary of only \$2,000. One-third received less than \$1,500 and one-fifth less than \$1,200. Only seven hundred received salaries above \$4,000 and four hundred received less than \$700.

December 18, 1919, Mr. John D. Rockefeller wrote a letter to the General Education Board in which he said: "It is of the highest importance that those entrusted with the education of youth and the increase of knowledge should not be led to abandon their calling by reason of financial pressure or to cling to it amid discouragements due to financial limitations. It is of equal importance to our future

welfare and progress that able and aspiring young men and women should not for similar reasons be deterred from devoting their lives to teaching." The letter was accompanied by securities valued at \$50,000,000. Mr. Rockefeller's previous gifts to the General Education Board exceeded \$76,000,000. In transmitting his great gift of December 18, 1919, he endorsed the policy of using the principal as well as the income as promptly and largely as might seem wise for the purpose of co-operating with the higher institutions of learning in raising sums specifically devoted to the increase of teachers' salaries.

December 15, 1920, Mr. Rockefeller removed all restrictions whatsoever on the power of the General Education Board to dispose in any manner it sees fit of the principal of all gifts to the Board. Up to June, 1921, the General Education Board had expended its entire income and more than \$42,000,000 of its capital. Approximately one-third of its capital funds have already been distributed. In the New England States twenty-two institutions have been aided with grants of approximately eight and one-quarter million dollars on terms which will add to the endowments of these institutions \$34,000,000. Thirty-two institutions in the Middle Atlantic States, sixty in the Southern States, seventy-seven in the Middle Western States and sixteen in the Western States have received appropriations of eight and one-half millions, twelve millions, sixteen millions and four millions respectively, on terms which will increase the funds of these institutions by approximately thirty-two, thirty-seven, fifty-three and twelve million dollars respectively. Two hundred seven institutions have been aided by appropriations of forty-eight and one-half million dollars, which in accordance with the terms of their contracts will increase the total endowments of these institutions by approximately one-sixth of a billion dollars.

One hundred and ninety-one institutions for whites have been aided. Thirty-six were endowed non-denominational and six were state institutions. Of the denominational in-

stitutions thirty-three are Baptist, two Catholic, seven Christian, fourteen Congregational, one Evangelical Association, six Friends, six Lutheran, thirty-nine Methodist Episcopal, twenty-eight Presbyterian, four Protestant Episcopal, three Reformed, one Seventh Day Adventist, one United Brethren, two United Presbyterian, and two Universalist.

In 1868, Mr. Rockefeller, a young trustee of Denison University, subscribed \$500 to an endowment fund of \$100,000 which the friends of the University were raising. He gave his note for one year with interest at seven per cent. On the date of its maturity he sent his check for \$535. May we not confidently hope that among the hundreds of thousands of donors to the endowment funds of two hundred and seven institutions of learning, inspired by Mr. Rockefeller's gifts administered by the General Education Board, there will be found hundreds who will carry to the end of the journey and deliver to the next generation the torch of Christian education which he received from the hand of Christian teachers and associates and has faithfully carried throughout a long and useful life?

---

## RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE COLLEGES

PRESIDENT E. D. BURTON

I have no paper to present, but only a brief statement to make. About a year ago Dr. Kelly proposed that a study of American colleges should be made with reference to the influences affecting the modern religious life of the students, looking to some possible betterment of conditions in our colleges. This proposal was presented to the Committee on Social and Religious Surveys, asking for their co-operation in the matter. That committee took the matter under careful consideration

and continued in consultation with Dr. Kelly, with the result that it seemed very desirable that such a study should be made, that it should cover all types of institutions in the United States which include in their scope of work the four-year college. In other words, that it should include the larger universities on private foundations such as Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, the state universities, the women's colleges, the New England colleges of the older type, and the colleges of the West which are on their way to become what some of these Eastern institutions already are.

It was felt that if such an investigation is to be made, it ought to be undertaken with the full knowledge, understanding and sympathy of the colleges, in order that there might be no possibility of a feeling that the institutions of one type or group were making an inquiry into the life and character of institutions of another type. With that in mind, efforts were made, extending over some weeks, to learn the mind of the representatives of these various types and groups of institutions. Visits were made either to the actual meetings of the following associations or to their officers: The Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Urban Universities, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Council of North American Student Organizations, and the American Council on Education. Counsel was also had with the Council of Church Boards of Education, the suggestion having originated with the Executive Secretary of that body.

I had the privilege myself of bringing this question to several of these bodies, and knowing the character of the reply in other cases; it is a pleasure to me to say that in every instance there has been a cordial response to the suggestion and indeed a very earnest desire that the in-



vestigation should be made. The only question that has been raised, and this certainly is a very proper one, is whether there would be an unprejudiced investigation. One or two presidents of the larger institutions were desirous of knowing whether this was an inquisition by a certain group representing certain interests or whether it was really a broad-minded inquiry into all the conditions. Upon being assured on that point all doubt as to the wisdom of it seemed at once to vanish. I could give names at length but I judge that it is not necessary.

I should, however, like to quote from the representative of one of these organizations. I called some months ago upon Dr. Capen, then, as you know, the Director of the American Council on Education, now the Chancellor of the University of Buffalo. He listened in silence to what I had to say for some ten minutes, and when I asked him, "Do you think such an investigation is desirable?" his answer was, "It is not only desirable, it is imperative. With one exception no question comes to this office so often as the question you bring, and we have no answer to it." He followed that with other remarks in the same spirit.

I am able therefore to bring back to this body, from whose Executive Secretary the suggestion came, the information that so far as can be ascertained by a somewhat extended inquiry among all types of institutions from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific and from the northern border at least to the Ohio River (we are not able to speak with quite as much confidence respecting the southern institutions) an inquiry of this sort would be welcomed with the single proviso that it shall be broad-minded and unprejudiced.

Just a word or two as to the scope of that inquiry. I suppose we must first endeavor to ascertain, not now by examining all the colleges of the country (there is no thought of making an exhaustive investigation in order

to report as to each institution), but by diligent inquiry in what may be regarded as typical institutions, first of all, what are the forces that are at work for good and for evil, for uplift and for downfall; secondly, how are these forces, especially those that make for uplift, working—effectively or ineffectively; which of them in this situation and which of them in that other quite different situation are most effective; and finally, what are the agencies and forces and methods which are most adapted to contribute to the development of the life of the student body in its spiritual aspects, broadly defined.

As to the method to be pursued: effort has already been made to secure the co-operation in the actual work of investigation of a rather large and representative advisory committee. I ought not to read the list of names which I have before me, because it contains names of persons who have not yet been approached, but I may describe their positions, enabling you to gather some impression of the character of the advisory committee that will be asked to direct the study: the president of one of our largest western universities; a man who has been for years a student pastor in one of our large American universities, and is looked upon by both college officers and by representatives of the institution as an exceptionally successful and wise worker in that field; a professor in one of the women's colleges; a secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association in one of the larger eastern institutions; the president of a New England college; the pastor of a large western church who himself has intimate contact with the colleges in both East and West; the dean of one of our larger municipal universities; the president of a western college, doubtless a member of this association; the executive secretary of this association; a professor in the Catholic University of Washington; the dean of the school of education in a western university; a Jewish rabbi, or perhaps as a substitute for him an officer of the Jewish Educational Association; the pastor of a New York City church, formerly intimately associated with

the student life of one of the larger New England universities; the dean of women in a state university.

That list will indicate to you that a diligent effort has been made to secure in this advisory committee persons who represent almost every point of view and almost every type of institution that would be brought within the scope of the study.

I have before me also a tentative list of those who may be selected actually to conduct the investigation. It would be, of course, unwise for me to read the list. No one of these persons has been selected or will be decided on without first obtaining the advice of the advisory committee. A good deal of thought has been given, a considerable inquiry has already been made, in order to discover among faculties of our universities persons peculiarly qualified to undertake this study. When they are selected effort will be made to detach them temporarily from their university or college positions in order that they may engage in this work.

Mr. President, this matter has not come before you formally before. I am very glad to have this opportunity of reporting it to you, and it would be gratifying, I am sure, to Dr. Kelly as the originator of this suggestion and to those whose co-operation he has sought in it, if you saw fit to express your judgment as to the wisdom of such an inquiry being made.

## DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN PLANTZ: Does the Association wish to make an expression upon this matter?

DR. BURTON: Inasmuch as the inquiry must be a selective, not an exhaustive one, I think I may make two statements. No institution will be included in the scope of the investigation except of its own cordial desire, and no institution will be included without thorough knowledge and understanding on the part of its officers and their co-operation. Secondly, the intention is not to make a report on

the conditions in individual institutions, but to disclose typical situations and out of these to discover, if possible, better methods of promoting the moral and religious life of students.

*Question:* May I ask exactly what organization is to be responsible for this investigation?

DR. BURTON: I am not surprised at the inquiry, because the body that is responsible for it financially is a new one. It is known as the Committee on Social and Religious Surveys. It has been in existence about two years. It has already issued some half dozen small volumes of reports on conditions in rural and city life. It has in process of preparation two or three times as many volumes, which will presently be issued; for example, a survey of the city of St. Louis, a survey of the city of Springfield, Mass.; a third study of which Dr. Kelly is the director, of the theological seminaries of the United States and Canada with reference to the efficiency or inefficiency of their work. Other studies of this general type are in progress. The Committee exists not to carry on executive work in the sense of performing the tasks which it studies, but in the various fields to promote efficiency by making surveys of conditions and practices. Its methods of operation are three: it sometimes subsidizes an investigation which is being carried on by some one else; in some cases it itself organizes a staff to make the investigation; and it sometimes enters into co-operation with other bodies, combining the two methods.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY KELLY: I have Dr. Burton's permission to say that the members of this Committee are Dr. John R. Mott, Chairman; Professor E. D. Burton, Mr. Raymond Fosdick, President Faunce of Brown University, and Dr. James L. Barton of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

CHAIRMAN PLANTZ: It seems to me this is a very important matter and worthy of our consideration. Is there any action you wish to take in relation to it?

PRESIDENT JAMES (Aurora College): Mr. Chairman, I

would like to move it is the sense of this Association that such an investigation would be of great value, and we are in sympathy with it.

The motion was seconded and carried.

---

## FOREIGN STUDENTS IN NORTH AMERICA

ELMER YELTON

*Executive Secretary of The Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students, International Committee of the Y. M. C. A.*

Several references have been made in this Convention to the development of understanding and good will among nations, and the educational processes which this involves. It is in the light of this problem of international and interracial relations that I bring to your consideration the ten thousand or more students from a hundred countries who are now enrolled in American schools and colleges. One speaker has said that the small college more than any other must reconstruct the fragments of our old philosophies into a new working principle of life; while a second speaker records the conviction that the task of the liberal college is to make and keep young people fit for freedom. If these are the ministries of the college to American youth, reared in the traditions and practice of freedom, what shall we say of its mission to these young people from less developed nations that are crossing the threshold from political absolutism or alien control to the molding of their own destinies? Thirty-five hundred students from Eastern and Southern Asia represent among us more than one-half the population of the world, and all of them will return to situations of political, religious and social ferment. China is suffering the pangs of a new birth into the modern world. Japan is in the throes of conflict



between a failing feudalism and the liberal movement. India rocks with rebellion against British rule and presents the strange spectacle of a revulsion against Western civilization. What will be the relation of the rising generation of these changing nations, who sit today in our American classrooms?

Let us avoid extravagant expectations of these students. Not all of them are destined to notable careers; many will fall to mediocrity or failure, just as students have always done. Their significance is rather in their potentialities for good or evil. Certain it is that every returned student will help to shape public opinion regarding America and other lands that he may have visited, or whose nationals he has known here. If he is not to be a leader in some area of his country's life, he will yet be an interpreter, in some unobserved position, of all he has seen and experienced during his student days among us. His impressions of our national character and institutions, of our place and promise in the world, will be propagated in the councils of state, the halls of learning, the counting rooms of business, and the circles of society,—wherever his lot, high or low, may be cast. Thus the fair or foul name of American Christian civilization will be established on the testimony of those who have come and seen for themselves. Let us not fool ourselves into believing that we shall be interpreted any longer by diplomats or missionaries or travellers: today these other peoples are reading our press and the reports of those of their own flesh and blood returning after a period of residence in America will carry weight over anything that may be represented by our own nationals living among them.

The unprecedented opportunity of American education with respect to these foreign students is to create a common denominator of thinking, whereby they may assimilate, carry back to their own national and racial cultures those elements of Western civilization which we believe ought to be incorporated in the life of the world.

This is not a process of Americanization but a means of universalizing our contribution to a new world civilization, which will find cohesion in the likenesses, and beauty and zest in the differences of mankind. It is in such a process of education for these students of other lands that we shall best widen the horizons of our American student body, and find the sensible approach to the whole tangled problem of race and nationality. Such colossal follies as those offered by Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard in the name of science, and by a recently quoted high official of the Klu Klux in the name of nationalism,—when he called for an organization of white men everywhere to maintain white supremacy against the yellow races,—can only be combatted through the common denominator of mind and purpose which it is the high privilege of our colleges to help develop.

The extent to which the habits of thought and ideals inculcated in American colleges may enter into the changing life of other nations may be visualized in the records of a few students who have gone back to China. The three chief delegates of China at the Washington Conference were graduates of American universities, as was the foreign minister who remained in Peking. Consider this short list of government officials and other leaders of today, and note how they touch various interests of the national life: A recent Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; the last two Ministers of Foreign Affairs; the last two Ministers to the United States; the Director General of the Peking-Hankow Railway; the Director General of the Chinese Eastern Railway; the Director of Reconstruction in Shantung—previous to the Japanese evacuation; the present Mayor of Canton; the foremost leader of the New Culture Movement at Peking; the National General Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Associations. It is the dawn of day for Young China, which is steadily pushing its way into places of power as they are vacated by the old politicians

and militarists. Whether this transfer of hegemony is to bring the redemption of China or perpetuate the rule of greed and corruption depends upon the character and dominating ideals of these younger men. There are two thousand of China's sons and daughters studying in America just now,—alert, industrious, and ardently patriotic. Shall the impact of our college and community life keep alive the passion for public service? A similar case can be made for the one thousand Japanese students who must soon return and make choice of the principle which they will serve in Japan. If there has ever been a Japanese menace or a yellow peril—immediate or remote—the men and women sitting in this room can do much to banish it to the limbo of forgotten fears by giving these Oriental students the conception and the experience of fair treatment and racial co-operation.

The Christian religion has much at stake in this foreign student group. They have seen first-hand the weaknesses and failures of our individual and corporate Christian life. The product of a mission school—Protestant or Catholic—is not long upon our shores till he learns that we are not as good as our Book—or our missionaries. The shock of American life is severe and not infrequently tears the student from the faith he accepted at home. Right in the shadows of our Christian colleges, as well as in the state universities, are being enacted the tragedies of spiritual life. On the other hand, comparatively few are being won to Christian allegiance, either Protestant or Catholic. Student migrations—at least from non-Christian lands—are registering a net loss to the church and to the Kingdom of God. Can we conceive a graver indictment of the vitality and efficiency of organized Christianity, and of its failure so far to Christianize our national life? Great numbers of these students, Christians quite as much as non-Christians, are going back to tell their people that this religion has failed in the lands of its greatest strength. What will

be the effect of this attitude upon our missionary enterprises abroad may well be imagined. Returning from a land where Christianity has had an almost unhindered opportunity, to lands that are groping for new religious truth and moral sanctions, many are turning with new assurance to the old faiths. Has not Confucianism held the Chinese state together since long before the birth of Christ, and has not India been the "mother of religions"? These students returning home share in the strongest degree the new nationalism and increased self-respect of their people, and most of them will be very critical of missionary policies and personnel. It is therefore fair to say that the foreign student in America has become a very important factor in the enterprise of foreign missions, and it is exceedingly important that he be enabled to know the best Christian people and see the church in its best spirit and product.

The Committee on Friendly Relations among Foreign Students endeavors to help the colleges meet the problems that have just been outlined. Our travelling secretaries cultivate the friendship of students, advise them in personal matters, bring them together for fellowship and exchange of ideas, and counsel with faculty and pastors, Christian Association workers, civic organizations and others who should be interested in their well-being. Every effort is made to provide for them these basic privileges of student life: personal friendship of president and professors; frequent contact with Christian family life; fellowship and service activities of a church; acquaintance with the best business and professional men and the best institutions of American life; self-expression and the representation of their own countries by means of talks before schools, civic societies, etc. We need more of these students in the colleges of this Association, where a maximum of personal interest in them may naturally be expected. The Friendly Relations Committee will be glad to advise more students to take at least their junior college work in these institutions.

If some of you will maintain special scholarships for deserving and properly accredited foreign students—regarding them as campus assets of international good will—we shall be ready to assist in finding the candidates. For any college this would be a far-reaching investment in the enterprise of building a brotherly world by building brotherly men.



# BULLETIN

The University of Chicago  
The Board of Trustees

For the year ending June 30, 1900  
The University of Chicago

Published by the University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill., June 30, 1900

Entered as second-class matter June 15, 1895  
Postoffice at Chicago, Ill., under No. 1000  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917  
Authorized by Act of October 3, 1917